R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 020 482 AC 002 257

ADULT LEARNING SEMINAR, PROCEEDINGS (SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, JUNE 12-16, 1967).

BY- ADAMS, HENRY B., ED

SYRACUSE UNIV.,N.Y.CONT.EDUC.CTR.FOR THE PUB.SERV.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST, NEW YORK

PUB DATE JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.24 104P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, *PROFESSIONAL CONTINUING EDUCATION, *CLERGYMEN, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, PHILOSOPHY, CHURCH ROLE, SOCIAL CHANGE, THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL TRENDS, MOTIVATION, PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS,

THIS ADULT LEARNING SEMINAR, OUTGROWTH OF MEETINGS SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, FOCUSED UPON NEEDS OF MINISTERS, OBJECTIVES OF PROGRAM OF CONTINUING EDUCATION, AND PROCESSES BY WHICH PROGRAMS ARE EVALUATED. THE CHANGING WORLD IN WHICH MINISTRY FUNCTIONS WAS DISCUSSED IN PAPERS ON MINISTRY AS EDUCATION OF PUBLIC, IMPLICATIONS OF THE ATOMIC AGE, FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH, FORMS FOR ARTICULATING ITS CHANGING STRATEGIES, AND IMPLICATIONS. ON-GOING PROGRAMS DESCRIBED INCLUDED A PILOT TRAING PROGRAM FOR MINISTERS WHO INFLUENCE URBAN ENVIRONMENT, SEMINARS HELD FOR YOUNG UNITED PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS, THE TOWER ROOM SCHOLARS PROGRAM AT UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN RICHMOND, AND A PROGRAM COMBINING RESIDENT AND IN-PARISH STUDY FOR DEGREES AT SAN FRANCISCO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. EDUCATION THEORY PRESENTATION INCLUDED AGE FACTORS IN CREATING ISSUES FOR ADULTS, EMERGING DIRECTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS, RELATING OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION, RELATING OBJECTIVES AND EDUCATION PROCEDURES TOWARD AN OPERATIONAL THEORY MOTIVATION, AND CURRENT DIRECTIONS IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION. APPENDED ARE A SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATIONS OF THE SEMINAR AND A LIST OF REGISTRANTS. THE CHARTER, BY-LAWS AND OTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY ARE ADDED. (RT)

ED020482

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ADULT LEARNING SEMINAR

1967

ADULT LEARNING SEMINAR

1967

PROCEEDINGS

Henry B. Adams
Editor

Conducted at the

CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTER FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Syracuse, New York

June 12 - 16, 1967

by the
Department of Ministry
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

PROGRAM

MONDAY
June 12

1:30 p.m. Denominational Meetings

4:30 Registration

6:00 - Dinner -

7:30 Evening Session
Worship - John E. Biersdorf
Orientation - Henry B. Adams

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY 2
- Thomas Green, Professor of the Cultural Foundations of Education, Syracuse University

TUESDAY
June 13

8:30 a.m. - Breakfast -

9:00 Worship - John E. Biersdorf

9:10 IMPLICATIONS OF THE ATOMIC AGE FOR MINISTRY 13
- Ronald McNeur, Studies Secretary, Division of Higher Education, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

10:00 - Coffee -

10:30 Discussion of address

11:30 - Recess -

12:00 - Luncheon -

1:30 p.m. THE ADULT YEARS 20
- Bernice Neugarten, Professor of Human Development, University of Chicago

2:45 - Coffee -

3:15 Case Study - INTERNSHIP FOR CLERGYMEN IN URBAN MINISTRY 28
- Robert Bonthius

4:30 - Recess -

6:00 - Dinner -

7:30 EMERGING DIRECTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS 32
- Allan Pfleger, Dean, Cleveland College, Western Reserve University

WEDNESDAY
June 14

8:00 a.m. - Breakfast -

9:00 Worship - John E. Biersdorf

9:10 Case Study - SEMINARS FOR YOUNG PASTORS 40
- John W. Van Zanten

10:00 - Coffee -

10:30 Discussion

11:30 - Recess -

12:00 - Luncheon -

1:30 p.m. Case Study - THE TOWER ROOM SCHOLARS PROGRAM ... 43
- Connolly C. Gamble

2:15 Workshop Groups

4:30 - Recess -

6:00 - Dinner -

7:30 Business Session

Organization of the SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY

THURSDAY
June 15

8:30 a.m.	- Breakfast -	
9:00	Worship - John E. Biersdorf	
9:10	RELATING OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION .... - Edgar W. Mills, Director, Ministry Studies Board	46
10:00	- Coffee -	
10:30	Discussion of address	
11:30	- Recess -	
12:00	- Luncheon -	
1:30 p.m.	Case Study - THE IN-SERVICE MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL PROGRAMS .... - Henry B. Adams	58
2:45	Workshop Groups	
4:30	- Recess -	
6:00	- Dinner -	
7:30	CHANGING STRATEGIES OF THE CHURCH IN SOCIETY AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS .... - Richard Nesmith, Executive Secretary, Planning and Strategy, National Division of the Board of Missions, Methodist Church	62

FRIDAY
June 16

8:00 a.m.	- Breakfast -	
9:00	Worship - John E. Biersdorf	
9:10	RELATING OBJECTIVES AND EDUCATIONAL PROCEDURES . - Thomas Klink, Division of Religion and Psychiatry, Menninger Foundation	66
10:00	- Coffee -	
10:30	CURRENT DIRECTIONS IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION .... - Jesse Ziegler, Executive Secretary, American Association of Theological Schools	76
11:30	Discussion of address	
12:00	- Luncheon -	

1:30 p.m. National Continuing Education Committee
- Mark Rouch, presiding

4:30 - Adjournment -

APPENDIX

Summary of Evaluations of the Seminar 82

List of Registrants 86

Minutes of Organizational Meeting of SACEM 91

Charter and By-Laws of SACEM 94

Information about SACEM 98

INTRODUCTION

Henry B. Adams

The antecedents of the proceedings which follow help to place the events in perspective. In 1964, under a grant from Lilly Endowment Inc., the first National Consultation on Continuing Education for Ministers was convened at Andover Newton Theological Seminary. For the first time leaders in the movement began to voice their needs and the requirements of their work in concert.

In response to requests that first year, a second National Consultation on Continuing Education for Ministers was called in 1965 at the University of Chicago. Without foundation aid, participants paid their own expenses, and the need for an annual assembly of leaders in this field was reaffirmed.

In 1966 the focus of the assembly shifted from consultation to the education of the educators and took the form of an Adult Learning Seminar at Michigan State University. In a business session, participants called for the organization of a society in which professionals giving leadership to continuing education could find collective expression.

In 1967, the Adult Learning Seminar held at Syracuse University became the occasion for the organization of the Society for the Advancement of Continuing Education for Ministry (SACEM) which now assumes responsibility for maintaining the activities which before had been guided by ad hoc committees.

1967, therefore, represents a milestone in the history of this movement. The dreams that gave direction, and the growing consensus about theory that bound leaders together, had acquired modest but important institutional form. The movement had begun to achieve maturity and stability.

In this context, the Adult Learning Seminar was planned to focus upon the needs of ministers, the objectives of programs of continuing education, and the processes by which programs are evaluated. Speakers were commissioned to prepare the papers that follow. These fell into three categories: 1) Presentations that would stretch the mind concerning the changing world in which ministry goes on; 2) accepted educational theory that bears upon continuing education; and 3) precise description of the way needs of ministers were established, objectives set, and evaluation carried on in selected on-going programs. In this context, participants were asked in small groups to describe their own programs for critical reaction by their peers, using the same threefold model of description.

What began under auspices of the Department of Ministry, National Council of Churches, has now become increasingly independent and more widely representative of those at the grass-roots of the work.

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY

Thomas Green

We are no longer, it seems to me, capable of declaring with anything approaching our accustomed clarity what we mean by the term "public." I shall not attempt to defend that declaration, but only to point out to you its seriousness. If we cannot arrive at some clear and functional conception of the public, then it seems to me we are ill-prepared to deal with such fundamental matters as what we mean by public schools, public education, the education of the public, the formation of the public man, education for participation in public life and so on. Nor are we able to explain clearly what we mean by public ministry or public worship or the ministry of the church to the public. If these matters seem to you small things to consider, then I shall ask you only to be patient. And if your feeling are the same by the time I finish, then I will gladly apologize.

The concept of a public or civic body is one of those fruitful ideas which is at the same time central to the tradition of social thought and amenable to almost endless changes. It is an idea in other words which is both pregnant and equivocal. And so when it is said, as I would argue, that education must be a public affair -- what public is it that we have in mind? What do we mean by "public"?

The idea of the public is troublesome, however, not only because it is so slippery but because it has received so little direct and sustained attention. There are certain resources upon which to draw -- but they are perhaps most notable for their inadequacy and inappropriateness to modern America. There is, for example, the polis of Aristotle, the space where the heads of families met in the ancient world as equals under no other necessity than their common agreement to speak and to act together. The public in this sense -- and I ask you to take special note of it -- was synonymous with a political body, and membership in it required participation in the political affairs of that body. Membership in it was indistinguishable from being a political agent, and was indispensable to being a human being.

Aristotle's famous principle was not that man is by nature a social being, but that he is by nature a political animal, not that man is by nature simply gregarious or that he happens to live in the presence of others, but that he is by nature a member of a civic body. The opposite of "public" -- and I ask you to take special note of that -- would be non-political rather than private. In our day we are inclined to oppose public and private. It is not appropriate to do so under the classical conception in the past. Typically, in the ancient world the power of the head of the family -- the patria protestas -- was without limit within its sphere. Relations in the family were by definition relations among unequals. And so the affairs of the family fell outside the public -- not because they were private -- but because they were non-political.

The public then was a political body, and education could be conceived in no other context than preparation for entrance into that body of free and equals. It was natural that both Plato and Aristotle should deal with education within the context of a concern for citizenship, and that they should see the exercise of citizenship as inseparable from the cultivation of both civic and human arete. Education in short was at once both technical and moral and at the same time civic. I ask you to note this because I will come back to it. It is often forgotten that the term techne was very closely connected with what the Greeks discussed when they talked about education and ideas.

So the ancient polis remains for us a kind of haunting memory of what we might mean by the "public." Nonetheless, it cannot constitute the model of what we mean by that word in discussions of public education and public schools. In the modern city and certainly in the states, to say nothing of the world-wide or regional family of nations, there is precious little to remind us of the public in the classic sense. Where is the res publica in a modern city -- in Chicago or in New York, for example.

Both Plato and Aristotle, as well as others in the ancient world, recognized that the polis must be small because it must be intimate and face to face. Indeed, that was the problem of Rome at one point -- how was it possible to govern an empire acquired sort of willy-nilly on the model of the civitas. Such a public cannot in principle be expanded beyond limits permitting a meeting of free and equals and a verbal exchange among them. The polis, insofar as it provides one model for the meaning of "public," is more closely related to a public defined by the concept of community than a public defined by the concept of society. The model of societas is that of a social relation which is founded on contract -- a kind of agreement -- the result of will, serving sometimes the temporary and sometimes the more durable needs of men. A contractual relation, however, is like a promise -- something one can enter and from which, therefore, one can be absolved.

The concept of society, or societas, was frequently based on the idea that men may be bound together by common interests -- a kind of *loose contractual* agreement, hence the predominance in the 18th Century of the social contract theory. It was really an attempt, in a way, to decide how it is that man may bring together what God has rent asunder -- namely the notion that since all people are separated, how is it that they ever come to be involved and implicated in a common society. The answer must be contract. The concept of society, then, was frequently based on the idea that men may be bound together by common interests.

But the word "interest" is a metaphor -- a metaphor that belongs to the conception of the public as societas -- for an "interest" -- inter est, understood literally, is that which stands between two men. It may be understood as that which, in coming between them, either separates or joins them. Between the North American Continent and Europe there stretches the Atlantic Ocean -- does it separate the continents or does it unite them? It depends on one's point of view. From one perspective, the ocean is surely an uncluttered highway which connects the two. The point of view of societas is that of separate men who are bound together by a kind of common interest, or common fate, in a common agreement. But that which unites them, that which is between, is of a different order from kinship of blood or common religion or long and mutually acknowledged historical loyalties.

These latter are more of the nature of communitas where they bind men in a public or a brotherhood as opposed to a partnership -- even when their interests diverge. The point is beautifully put by Toonies in Community and Society when he discusses his contrast between gemeinschaft and gesellschaft: "The theory of the gesellschaft, which is what I have here called societas, deals with the artificial construction of an aggregate of human beings which superficially resembles the gemeinschaft or community insofar as the individuals live and dwell together peacefully. However, in gemeinschaft they remain essentially united in spite of all separated factors -- whereas in gesellschaft they are essentially separated in spite of all uniting factors."

The classical polis does not provide a useful image out of which to build a modern understanding of the public. The ancient res publica is not much better. Both are essentially political conceptions and the modern understanding of the public is not. The latter term moreover calls to mind the conception of the legal organization of the public -- namely the state -- and that is not what we mean by the public either. The notion of a national society with its historic relations to the social contract period and the Roman societas is too large and too much connected with the idea of polity and too likely to admit many publics in a society without seriously coming to grips with the term "public" at all.

If we are to understand the meaning of "public" in discussions of public education, public schools, the education of the public, service to the public, then part of what is needed is some symbol of the public adequate to express and to evoke the needed social commitment of our time. What we seek is some formulation of the idea of public so that through the process of education men may find it believable that they are, in some sense, united in spite of all separating factors. In that respect, our understanding of a public must bear some of the marks of gemeinschaft or communitas. Such a symbol cannot be discovered in the mere fact that from time to time we are prompted to associate with one another around some shared interest; nor can it be found, as Cicero would have it, in some common agreement concerning what is good. The public must contain disagreement. An adequate symbol of public life must transcend mere interest.

At this point allow me to digress once more and explore more carefully one form of this idea of a public which transcends mere interest, a public in which men are united, in spite of all separating factors -- the idea of communitas. The word is Latin in origin. Little and Scott gloss the term to communico, which means literally to share something as in the giving and receiving of gifts. The word "share," however, is Anglo-Saxon in origin, and aside from communico and its cognates -- communion, communication, community -- there is nothing quite like it in Latin. The word "share" referred originally to the leading edge of the plough, the plough share. The idea, going all the way back to the Greeks and apparently existing whenever societies are spacially located, is that the community involves a division of something. In this case it was land, and the plough was the instrument for dividing -- the marking off what is mine and what is others. The idea is that community involves the sharing of something, i.e. it involves division and distribution. It is something which is sometimes referred to as the suum cui que of the community, the object of the community.

Every community is a community because there is something the members share, but its sharing may be various, a parcel of land, a basket of apples, an idea -- as in communication -- a purpose. A community, then, is a state of affairs in which something is shared by dividing, but we cannot say without, explanation, that the thing divided is always the thing shared because in some cases to divide the thing shared is to destroy it. Let us suppose for example that we share a piece of pie. We must divide the pie. You take one part and I another. But we can also speak of sharing a car, and in this case we cannot mean dividing a car in a sense of cutting it up, What we divide in this case is the time of its use. I can share a car in the sense in which I share a secretary. It does not mean severing the parts. This means that I share her time or her services. A share in a corporation entitles me not to a brick in a building or a piece of the structure, but to a part of the profits. In each of these cases, sharing involves a division and a distribution, a cutting and a separating.

What shall I say, however, when I speak of sharing a secret? It seems not to fit the description I have given of the principles involved in the idea of sharing. Yet sharing a secret, no less than sharing space under an umbrella, may constitute a community. I want to comment on this idea a bit later. It seems to involve -- the sharing of a secret -- not a division and a distribution but apparently only a distribution. Observe this further point, however. If sharing typically involves a division or a distribution of something, it must mean also the distribution of the benefits of that thing as well as the disadvantages. But is this really true? Might not the distribution be unequal -- can't I share something without sharing both its benefits and liabilities? It seems to be the case that I can share something without sharing its liabilities, but I cannot share something without sharing its benefits. I might conceivably share a garden tractor without sharing the liabilities implicit in its upkeep, in buying gas and so on. My son shares our car. He does not share its upkeep. I sometimes view it as an unfair distribution of shares but it is still what we call and would easily recognize as sharing. Suppose, however, that I share a secretary and yet do not take advantage of her services, can I really be said to have shared something if I do not share in its benefits? To fail to make use of a secretary's time may count against our saying that I share her services.

To share, typically, is to divide and distribute, and this distribution seems to involve implicitly the division and distribution of benefits. Dividing is not done in order to divide benefits and thereby diminish them. It is done rather to extend benefits and spread them. This is perhaps where the idea comes from: to share is to enjoy the benefit of something as in the giving and receiving of gifts -- which is in fact the root meaning of the Latin communico which underlies the idea of community. And may I also say this notion -- that sharing isdone, division is done and distribution of benefits is done to multiply these benefits -- is also very much like, I think, what we mean in the sharing of a secret; it is transmitted and shared without diminishing.

Allow me one further step along the path of this digression. Suppose we ask how does the word "common" enter the picture. It, too, is related to community and the public -- though in a specially interesting way. It is sometimes said that one of the features of a community is that what the members share is a common interest, a common purpose, a common ownership, a common aim of some kind. The point I want to stress here is that when we think of community as having its basis in sharing, then we are close to the idea of that which is in common. When we speak of sharing something we speak of sharing it in common: we share a car in common; we share an umbrella in common. The apparent difference is this. Whereas the root idea of sharing is division and distribution, to share something in common does not involve an act of division and distribution but rather a joint ownership or joint possession. Community property is property jointly held. It is undivided.

The Boston Common was that property which was left undivided and which literally belonged to everyone. It was, in a quite literal sense, that property that was held jointly by all men. It was the wealth that was held in common or, as we learned to say finally, it was the commonwealth. When we learned to combine the words, the result contained much of its former association. The commonwealth was that thing or object which was owned by people jointly. The _res_ in the language of the Roman law, the _res_ which as the Romans put it belonged to the people, or, the _res publica_ was the republic. The republic then is the commonwealth.

I remind you then how all these words ring with overtones of community, with association and of belonging together. If we think of community as based in sharing, then we should be led to consider that which is in common among men. The idea now of that which is in common is the idea of a joint object of jointly held purpose or interest or joint ownership. This is an important point. One will find social thinkers and sociologists, and, not a few times, theologians speaking repeatedly as though community requires of men that they have a common aim, purpose or object. And that is not true unless we understand all that is involved in the use of the word "common" here. Here is where we can begin to say something about what is involved in sharing a common purpose or common idea or sharing a secret. The point is to observe that many people may have the same purpose, say to get from New York to Newburgh. They may have a common purpose in the sense of all having the same purpose. But for the existence of community it is not enough that they all have an idea in common, in the sense of having the same idea, the same goal. They must, in addition, have an idea or purpose which they hold jointly.

What is wanting here is the difference between many men engaging in the same activity, independent of one another, as opposed to their engaging in it jointly. Community requires of men to have a common purpose only if that purpose involves them in joint activity -- i.e. in building something together that they could not have achieved separately. The statement that A and B -- two persons -- have a common purpose, is ambiguous. It may mean only that they have the same or a joint purpose; it may mean that they have two purposes which happen to be aligned; or that they have a joint purpose which they share. It is precisely this ambiguity which is subtle when we focus on the idea of community as sharing. It may in fact be the coincidental correspondence of interest, purposes, etc. which underlies the idea of _societas_ -- a coincidental correspondence of interest. Five thousand people, with the same purpose in mind, do not constitute a community. But being in proximity to one another, community may exist in some kind of relationship, if for no other reason than a necessity to take account of one another. And that resembles very closely the kind of relations that exist in an urban setting where there is society but no community.

As Toonies puts it, the root idea of _communitas_ is the idea of a bond which unites in spite of all that separates us. Whereas the root idea of _societas_ is of a separateness in spite of all that unites us. You may now add another feature to the idea of _communitas_, and that is that a community answers to some genuine and durable needs of men rather than to merely temporary interests such as the sharing of an umbrella. The thing I have in mind is this. One of the characteristics of community may well be that one of the things shared is a memory -- a memory of some kind. And this may be so important in shaping and in developing the new forms of public in modern society that it proves to be decisive.

The kind of thing that is wanted, I think, is best displayed in that panoply of symbols surrounding the Hebrew notion of the people. When the Bar mitzvah declares "I am a Jew," there is called forth the memory of a long history of belonging to a people or public. And that public transcends differences of interest, geographic boundaries, and economic and political distinction. But the important point of this illustration is that what constitutes the public -- what evokes its consciousness in people -- is not a shared interest or an agreement about what is good. It is a common memory transmitted through a set of shared symbols adequate to communicate that membership. And what is even more important, and this I ask you to take special note of, is that this conception of the public does not establish any solid division between what is public and what is private. Membership in a public in the Hebraic sense is not set over against membership in a family. It is in no way confined to political affairs or civic affairs, yet it leads to participation in the shared life of a people. It is a different view. That is the kind of thing that you see in the Hebrew notion of the people.

It suggests that what is required for the education of the public, indeed for the formation of a public, is some conception of the public and some way of communicating that conception so that the public is seen to extend back into the past and forward into the future. This is simply to say that one of the functions of educating the public is to assist in forming a self-identity -- not only through participation in a contemporary community, but also through memory of some historical community. This is one of the decisive points at which contemporary schools fail utterly.

I have mentioned so far four key ideas in understanding the public: the polis, the notion of sharing, community, and the Hebraic idea. There are other ways of understanding the idea of a public, approaches which rely less heavily than the Hebrew view of the effects of a common history or shared mythology. Perhaps the most sustained and direct attack on the idea of the public is to be found in that most neglected of all John Dewey's writings, namely The Public and Its Problems. There he set out directly to answer the question "what do we mean by the public?" His answer rests neither upon the idea of a common interest nor upon the idea of contract -- nor does he suggest that the existence of a public stems from the existence of a state or the way the state is organized.

He finds out instead that among the transactions which occur among men, there are some whose effects do not extend beyond the lives of those immediately engaged. But there are other transactions whose consequences reach far beyond those immediately concerned. Here is the germ of the distinction between public and private. When the consequences of an action extend far afield, when the consequences of an act go far beyond those directly concerned, then the act takes on a public character -- whether, as he puts it, the conversation be carried on by a king and his prime minister, or by Cataline and a fellow conspirator, or by merchants planning to monopolize a market. A public then is constituted by all those who are in fact affected for good or ill by certain actions. Dewey says "Those indirectly and seriously affected by any action form a group distinctive enough to deserve a name -- the name selected is the public."

This view has several consequences. In the first place, it follows that the existence of a public is a question of fact. It is not something which needs forming, as much as it simply needs recognizing. There are at least two ways in which a public may fail to be recognized. In the first place, it may fail in self-recognition -- and this is what I want to say is primarily characteristic of the Church. A public can fail in self-recognition. For example, those whose lives will seriously be affected by the location of a school may be unaware, not only of how the decision may influence them, but they may also be unaware of the fact that it may touch them at all. Hence they remain what Dewey calls an inchoate public lacking self-consciousness. They are affected without knowing that they are being affected. They are, according to Dewey, a public nevertheless, and potentially they are an articulate public.

On the other hand, a public may fail to be recognized by those who are responsible for acting. Those who are charged with the responsibility of taking action may fail to recognize who is affected by their actions. Hence, the school authorities, for example, may fail to recognize who is touched by their actions, or they may simply ignore them. This is a fairly accurate description of the relation between the public and the school officials during the recent controversies in New York over the control by 201 and PS 36 in Harlem. What was for a long time an inchoate public in Harlem has become what Dewey calls a concerned public: it becomes self-conscious and identified, but the decisions of the school authorities often appear to be made without reference to that concerned public. Public decisions are then seen as removed from the public, as in no way expressive of the concerns of the affected public. In any case, the point I want to make is that, according to Dewey, a public is defined by the actual consequences of actions taken; a concerned public arises when people are aware of the consequences of these actions.

But in the second place, Dewey's view implies that there are many publics. Presumably there are as many publics as there are consequential issues calling for action. Here, it should be observed that a public in Dewey's sense is not confined to people who have a common interest or the same interest in some issues. A public contains people who have divergent or even conflicting interests; hence the public defined in many current school controversies, such as those so publicized in New York City, includes not only parents and children but teachers and other professionals, political representatives, business associates, and many others who see their interests as divergent and who are differently persuaded.

The fundamental political task is to bring into some comprehensive whole not only the diversity within each such public, but between various publics which may come into existence. This is an extraordinary, complex and exciting political problem in contemporary urban affairs.

From within this framework of thought there are important things that can be said about educating the public or education for public participation. To begin with the existence of a public is, for Dewey, a matter of fact and not a result of education. But what is often needed is the transformation of an inchoate public into a concerned and articulate public. That does require education. One must learn how it is that decisions do affect and touch one's life.

If we distinguish between "knowing how" and "knowing that," between skills and information, then we can say that the creation of a concerned public requires a great many kinds of knowing that -- knowing that such and such decisions are pending -- that they are likely to have such and such consequences -- that they are likely to be made by such and such persons or officers who have such and such other conflicting pressures -- that one has certain rights to information relevant to those decisions, and so forth.

But participation in a concerned public is also likely to require many kinds of knowing how -- knowing how to exercise one's rights -- how to make information widely available -- how to influence those in authority -- how to conduct meetings -- how to contact allies -- how to obfuscate the efforts of enemies, and the like.

The point is that education of that kind of public for that kind of public is heavily laden with the exercise of skills, and the Church is not notable in its command of these skills. For preparation for citizenship, it may be that the good man is not in demand if he be good for nothing.

In short, education of the public tends to resemble more closely technical education which becomes tied to a kind of technical reason, and civic problems to technical problems. Remember what I said about the Greek notion of education witin the polis -- where it is at the same time technical, moral and civic. I repeat, it may be that the good man is not in demand if he be good for nothing. In short, education of the public tends to resemble technical education, civic action becomes tied to a kind of technical reason, and civic problems to technical problems.

Given this sort of framework in the quest for understanding what education is for the modern public, if I were to ask myself who (within the resources of the Church) has commented most excitingly on these matters, I would have to turn to Richard Niebuhr.

As far as I can determine, Richard Niebuhr's book The Responsible Self is in fact, and for very strange reasons I think, the first major work of moral theory in the history of the West to make the concept of moral responsibility more fundamental even than the ideas of the right, the good, and the fitting. Within the last eighteen months I have tried to look back through the history of western ethical thought, and I think it's true that there is not another major moral philosopher in the history of western ethics who takes the concept of responsibility to be more fundamental than the ideas of the right, the good, and the fitting. Indeed, there are two paragraphs in all of Aristotle that deal with responsibility. Neither one of them deals with it in Niebuhr's sense. It isn't a concept which looms large in western thought until the nineteenth century when the utilitarians were concerned with the reformation of public policy. It is interesting that when we become concerned with the pubpublic, we become concerned with the moral category of responsibility. Niebuhr understands responsibility to be quite literally the ability to respond to what is happening in a public network of relations. His thought is based upon the ideas of George Herbert Mead. The significance of his work is that he interprets moral behavior in the context of a public, in the modern sense of a public not a community. He interprets moral behavior in the context of a public in the modern sense and sees the moral agent as possessing a certain kind of civic skill, a certain kind of civic arete. He sees the responsible self as a kind of moral technologist, if that term doesn't seem too far-out. The responsible self is a kind of moral technologist, the man who has a technical conscience, no different in kind however as between his public and his private life. The responsible self is able to respond to acts of love and intimacy and to return them equally as well as he is able to respond to the acts of public officials on public questions. Niebuhr's conception of the responsible self is the conception of a man who lives and acts within a public in the sense in which Dewey intended, and yet it is not a view of a moral agency which sets up any hard and fast dichotomy between the social skills required in public life and the capacity to respond in the intimacy of one's private associations. Such an approach to the nature of civic education might provide a means of preserving the unity of the Hebraic view as between the public role and private life. Such a view is heavily laden with the political connotations so central in the classical view of the public. It places a heavy premium on the cultivation of the necessary social skills which are so functional a requirement for life in modern urban society. The sphere of intimacy is very limited in the urban setting, and the social skills essential for participation in the public may nonetheless be exercised in relation to a narrowly circumscribed image of who is one's neighbor.

What is at the same time crucial, and also omitted from all these suggestions, is any means of representing and communicating, in the process of education, the kind of social commitment which transcends temporary interest and is the basis for a social concern that extends beyond ones' immediate public in Dewey's sense. In short, the education of a public requires an image of the solidarity of men in a public sufficient to evoke a social commitment of the suburbanite in the solution of the problems in the city, and a social commitment of the rich to the poor, of the religiously diverse to the service of those who do not share their peculiar history or their uniquely defined community. What is demanded for the modern education of the public is a symbol of the social commitment so necessary in our day, a vivid image of how it is that we are united in spite of all divisions -- a conception of the public which bears the marks of communico in the midst of an urban technological society, but which at the same time does not involve us in a nostalgic return to the small spacial and limited community of New England or the frontier. It is a conception of the public that doesn't involve us in a too large preoccupation with the nature of I-thou -- which I think is also a preoccupation of error. It does not seem to me that the goal of this kind of public is attainable in a society where schools are structurally and culturally devoted to the task of selecting, certifying and sorting people for the various slots within the economic and military institutions of our society.

It does not seem to me that this goal is attainable through schools which are structured for those purposes. The social skills essential for participation in the public may well be strengthened by such a system of schools because they place a premium on the capacities of students who learn to take a long view, how to manipulate the school establishment, and work the system properly in order to get the right certification. And that is a social skill which is indispensable in our society. It is too bad, and it may be a condemnation of American society to say it is useful. But it is extremely doubtful in my mind that such a school system can properly turn its attention to assisting young people in interpreting their lives, and visibly transmit the necessary civic mythology essential for the formation of the public. If there is some tension between the function of education for citizenship and for manpower, for certification and for membership in the community -- if there is some tension between these two functions and the fundamental contending functions of education -- then this tension must be more poignantly added to the struggles of both young and old alike, seeking to interpret their lives in their place with others in some kind of public.

Now, in conclusion -- and I am almost at the point of conclusion -- there are two points that I want to stress which have to do more directly with the continuing education of the ministry. I have made many points along the way which I hope will be taken seriously as you discuss what the continuing education of the ministry is and what the ministry of the Church is to a public in the modern world.

In recent years one of the major categories of thought, with which the church has struggled, is the concept of community. The Church has tended to understand the model of community, out of its own tradition, to be *Koinonia* -- a relatively small interdependent intimate group. At least it gets translated that way. There has been a tendency moreover to think that *Koinonia* has been lost in modern society, and, being lost, must be restored. In short, community has been thought of frequently as something to be made or shaped, something that needs to be formed. And so we've talked about small group learning, small group process, and we've set up Koinonia -- groups and congregations, which was for a time quite the rage. In short, community has been thought of as something made or shaped, something that needs to be formed within the congregation.

With respect to the idea of community we should recognize that there are two different sources. The classical notion is the *polis*, and the biblical idea, the New Testament idea, is *Koinonia*. The former idea of community *is* the idea of something which can be made, and therefore can be destroyed and need remaking. The *polis* is a creation; it can be made; it can be destroyed; it can be remade. But the idea of *Koinonia* is the idea of a gift. That is, the idea of a *polis* is a sociological notion and the concept of *Koinonia* is a theological one. The *Koinonia* is not something that needs restoring since, being understood as a gift of God, it is a fact; it is given and is not open to men to destroy or to restore. The problem of *Koinonia* is rather like Dewey's problem of an inchoate public. The character of an inchoate public is not that it doesn't exist but that its members are not self-conscious of their membership. An inchoate public is not yet a concerned public. Similarly it seems to me the problem for the church is not to restore *Koinonia* but to become conscious of it as a fact. In the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, Paul says of the bread and wine, "is this not the Koinonia?" And he is speaking of the bread and wine. The symbol of Koinonia is not, therefore, the symbol of the public. It is rather the symbol of the solidarity of all men which, becoming conscious, allows them to recognize the basic *need* for the formation of a public.

In short, what I am saying is that the public is not a community in the sense of *Koinonia* nor in any other sense that I can think of. It is not a community, nor is it a state, nor a society. It is not a criticism to say that the society of modern America is not the *polis*, nor even that the public lacks the character of the community. It is not a criticism to say that our society lacks community. It is simply to recognize that we are dealing with different ideas. What I've tried to suggest, in short, is that education of the public and for the public and for public ministers involves first the transmission of some symbol sufficient to evoke a conviction of the solidarity of men. It cuts through the usual differences which separates them. Here what is important is some symbol such as the Hebrew idea of the people, or the Christian notion of the *Koinonia*, or the bread and wine. Indeed, what else is the Christ event except the proclamation of the solidarity of man? It is, of course more, but what else is it besides? It is that.

Secondly, what is required in the education of the public man is the developed skills to make that solidarity effective, and here is where the Church has been most significantly, it seems to me, deficient. This is the element of responsibility in Niebuhr's sense -- the development of these skills.

Now, one last remark. I have often asked myself, what is it that stands in the way of the Church recognizing the proclamation in its celebration of worship, and in the Christ event itself? Here lies, somehow, the most fundamental and pervasive proclamation of the solidarity of man that we know. I think there are two things for the failure in recognition -- and I comment half facetiously. I think one of the reasons for this is that theologians and trained clergymen have not been preoccupied with eschatology. It invariably turns out to be the last thing that is discussed in systematic theology, and theologians never live long enough to get to the end. Secondly -- something I have encountered again and again in pastors and preachers -- the most elementary confusion within the education of the ministry between eschatology and Apocalypse. There is rejection, because of this confusion, of anything meaningful in real life eschatology, and if there is nothing meaningful in real life eschatology, there is nothing meaningful in worship. And if there is nothing meaningful there -- there can be no public ministry because there can be no public.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE ATOMIC AGE FOR MINISTRY

Ronald W. McNeur

Western man, indeed world man, is completely committed to living in the atomic age. By this I mean that all of us, whether we know anything about atomic physics or not, are automatically involved in thinking of, speaking about, and using the stuff of the world in which we live on the assumptions of atomic physics and that we have, perhaps quite unconsciously, dispensed with the categories that were held to be basic in the era of classical or Newtonian physics. When our taxes pay for nuclear research, when we get electricity from atomic power, when we buy drugs that have been developed by research in molecular biology we are functioning as men in the atomic age. We have ceased thinking of and using the world under the direction of Newtonian concepts.

Men of the Newtonian era developed special ways of talking of and acting in relation to their concepts of man's purpose and destiny. It is known as Theism. It is the contention of this paper that atomic age man is in the process of working out new categories for talking of and acting in relation to man's purpose and destiny, that many of the concepts we have inherited from Theism are colored by the way men formerly thought of the world and that these concepts are quite inadequate for use in the present day. The claim will be made that the era of Newtonian-theistic man is gone and we must reach forward and seek different religious concepts for the age of what I shall call atomic age-ethos man.

The Machine Model of Newtonian Physics

The basic model used by Newtonian-theistic man to talk about and act in relation to the world of nature was the machine. The key to the development of the machine model lies in the philosophy of complete separation of the material and the spiritual. A clear statement of this position is found in Meditation VI, Rene Descartes' Meditations: "It is certain that this I (that is to say, my soul by which I am what I am), is entirely and absolutely distinct from my body and can exist without out."

With this separation accepted, man was able to proceed as a detached spectator in relation to nature examining, analyzing, cataloguing and defining the laws by which this other entity separate from his "I" functioned. The world, the universe was regarded as a machine which followed determined patterns which were predictable in terms of cause and effect. It was assumed that reality was observable, that what man observed was reality, that matter was ultimate and that all of nature was a unity bound in one cause and effect, deterministic system. On the basis of these assumptions, Newton, Kepler and the early scientists began their experiments and defined their laws. They were eminently successful and before long man turned from defining the machine of nature to building his own machines with which to alleviate the drudgery of work and to improve production.

The machine model, so useful in the areas of classical physics and engineering, was now applied to all areas of man's thought and life. It was a simple and logical step to apply it to the areas studied by the physical sciences and it was presumably another simple step to apply the concept to man himself. Indeed, de la Mettrie had set the way in his essay, "L'Homme Machine," when he wrote "The term soul is an empty one -- let us then conclude boldly that man is a machine, and that the whole universe consists only of a single substance (matter) subject to different modifications."

Eventually, we reached the stage when the machine model was thoroughly applied to man. In the anthropology of Darwin, man's history was cast in the mechanistic mold and with Freud, his psyche. The soul that Descartes had thought to keep quite separate was fitted to the same model. Not only was the machine of a nascent technology equipped with the basic dynamic to change and form society, but its model became the way in which man understood himself. The tremendous price that had to be paid was that all these developing areas of knowledge could not contain any mental or spiritual categories. We reached the stage where any discipline of knowledge must conform to the basic machine categories in order to be acceptable in the formal schools of education. Even the so-called creative arts and humanities are caught in the requirement to be factual. The study of form, the analysis of technique and method, the recording of history takes precedence over the creative. In Scientia which assumes a determinism, creativity is finally anathema.

Religion as Separated Piety-Theism

What had happened to the Cartesian concept of soul? Descartes had unfortunately spoken of it in spacial terms by setting it in a small gland in the center of the brain and had opened the way for it being made the object of scientific study by terming it the res-cognitans, the thinking thing. It therefore was treated in the general categories of thingness. And when it could not be found in the penial gland, it was completely discounted. This set the stage for de la Mettrie's materialistic conclusion.

Nevertheless the religious life of man continued to be developed and organized. Necessarily it followed a crippled road. The general philosophy had been clearly set that religious thought could contain no material or structural terms. God and the soul of man were finally set on the other side of an impregnable wall from man's activity in regard to nature and knowledge. It developed in what we generally call Theism. The split in man and his world can be diagrammed as follows:

BODY

Machine Model Assumptions:

Causality
Determinism
Matter Ultimate
Reality Observable
Man Spectator
Unity of Nature

SOUL
(Mind)

God

Theistic
Religion as Separated

Piety

It was not difficult for the religion of Theism to flourish in its seclusion on its side of the wall. It was possible to pick up those strands of religious thought and those verses of biblical literature which could be used to emphasize the separation from the world and rationalize the position of piety. Religion was then concerned with the soul which must be trained in piety and made pleasing to God. All this religious activity and thought could be conducted on the soul side of the wall.

In practice it was not easy to hold the complete theoretical division. The Theists and Deists attempted to develop a theology which was compatible with the machine model of man and nature. God became the "retired mechanic" who could be granted the honor of the initial invention, but he was no longer involved. In this, mechanism dominated piety and eventually piety rebelled and asserted its right to its side of the wall. With this move mechanism defined itself as openly atheistic.

On the other hand the theology of piety adopted some of the patterns of thought from the body side of the wall. The most tragic one was the proposition that truth or reality could only be expressed as fact -- empirical, observable, datable, quantifiable fact. In addition it was assumed that the documents of piety, especially the Bible, and the areas of life and history there discussed were solely in the domain of piety. These assumptions were both challenged with the anthropology of Darwin and the pious fought vigorously to maintain their completely untenable assumptions. There was a place to attack the Darwinian position, but we had to await the arrival of a new type of anthropologist who was not so committed to mechanism and the opaque man. The pious were in no position to do this for they were working on the same presuppositional base as Darwin himself.

Although there was some borrowing of concepts from one side of the wall by the other, in the broad view the separation was complete. The pious saw meaning only in the saving of the soul and regarded the other side of the wall as the evil secular. The materialist, using the machine model to control matter and applying a basic principle of quantification, could see no reality in the intangible. Western civilization has been dominated by this split for three centuries and both its technological and religious development have been profoundly affected. Thus theological categories were developed by Newtonian-theistic man that were all influenced and in some cases determined by his commitment to the machine model concept of nature and the social implications of that model. The doctrine of creator carried the overtones of inventor. Seventeenth century man, in the social tension caused by the concept of the divine right of kings, could speak easily and existentially of the sovereignty of God. Jesus Christ as Lord was a very useable concept in the age of lords and princes, and the concept of a personal savior fitted well into the basic pietistic concern for the salvation of the individual soul. The extremely limited area given to the Holy Spirit, that of conviction of the individual soul as to the truth of the faith, was required by the impossibility of creativity and newness within a machine-model frame of reference. The acceptance of creedal statements as the test of legitimacy was a natural development. The liturgy of Newtonian-theistic man was developed to include many of these former concepts. It should be noted that machine model thinking also encouraged a laissez-faire attitude to concepts of change and social action.

The Revolution of Atomic Physics

The twentieth century is experiencing a revolution in which the whole question of man in his relation to nature is called up for review again. The significant change came in the development of atomic physics. It was found that the basic presuppositions of classical physics were not tenable in the world of microphysics. The experiments and theorizing of Planck, Einstein, Bohr, Heisenberg and others have shown clearly that the axioms of classical physics concerning the ultimacy of matter, the observability of reality, the spectator role of man, causality, determinism, predictability and the unity of nature -- all must be discarded or revised. Einstein's historic equation introduced the primacy of energy and discarded the basic concept of reality being observable. Planck's experiments with black body radiation introduced the photon of light and the quantum of energy and disrupted both the wave theory of light and the traditionally held concept of continuity in nature. Bohr's work in atomic physics had to acknowledge the involvement of man in his study. The scientist in the process of measuring can only measure what occurs to the atom when it is responding to this measuring. Heisenberg's principle demonstrates the inability of man to measure accurately and record all aspects of a situation which he is investigating.

With these developments the whole range of assumptions traditionally held by physics were revised. The change did not come without great struggle and anguish as is indicated by the following statement by Niels Bohr:

> How radical a change in our attitude towards the description of nature this development of atomic physics has brought about is perhaps most clearly illustrated by the fact that even the principle of causality, so far regarded as the unquestioned foundation for all interpretation of natural phenomena, has proved too narrow a frame to embrace the peculiar regularities governing individual atomic processes. Certainly everyone will understand that physicists have needed very cogent reasons to renounce the ideal of causality itself; but in the study of atomic phenomena we have repeatedly been taught that questions which were believed to have received long ago their final answers had most unexpected surprises in store for us.[1]

The result of this most interesting development in atomic physics in our time has been to impose severe restrictions upon the applicability of the machine model within the discipline of physics itself. It is now a legitimate model only when one is dealing with massive systems, and even in engineering where it is most obviously relevant new dimensions are being introduced. The systems approach, operations research, the study of the nature of change, courses on creativity and the growing emphasis of the social responsibility of the engineer all point to a significant redirection.

Some Effects of the Revolution and a New Theology

As a result of this major revolution in man's understanding of himself in relation to nature in physics, two significant developments arise. The first is that the solid wall that divided body and soul, or the mechanistic model and piety, is now energized out of its solidity. It is, in effect, no longer there. The second is that all those aspects of knowledge that felt compelled earlier to adopt the machine model because of its universal acceptance now are freed of this restriction. It is now possible for them to be approached in a completely new way.

---

[1] Niels Bohr, Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge, p. 25.

With regard to the removal of the wall we can say that the pious are the more surprised and embarrassed. They are used to being isolated and are happy in their seclusion. It is embarrassing to have your neighbor, who has been in many ways an enemy, remove the wall that separates without warning and without concern. The embarrassment is both tempered and heightened in a peculiar way. It is tempered because piety has a built-in isolation principle which it can call upon. As a form of religion which developed in the context of the wall, it has no language or thought or action that can be used with the wall removed and it can talk to itself as though the wall were still there. But, this also heightens the embarrassment. What true religious thought and language and action for the life with the wall removed must be sought urgently?

Dietrich Bonhoeffer points the beginning of the way for the theologian nursed in piety.

> Honesty demands that we recognize that we must live in the world as if there were no God. And this is just what we do recognize -- before God: God himself drives us to this realization -- God makes us know that we must live as men who can get along without Him. The God who is with us is the God who forsakes us (Mark 15:34)! We stand continually in the presence of the God who makes us live in the world without the God -- hypothesis.[2]

But this is only the beginning. It is the clearing away of some of the patterns and attitudes developed in the time of isolation which are not suitable for the new age. For those nurtured in piety it may be that the main way of advance is by negation of the traditional language and thought forms of piety and searching for new language and thought forms that spring from the mainstream of religious history. But it is more likely that significant change will come from involvement in the whole movement of life which has begun the revolution. For the person raised in piosity or in the theology of isolation, it is necessary that he at least recognize that the categories of pious and secular now no longer have meaning and that the negative connotation of the world must be discarded. With the wall removed we stand together on a plane and the only criterion that can be used is man in his involvement. We can neither use the model of the machine nor the model of piosity to assist us in understanding our world or ourselves. The only given is man in his involvement and it is a given context with a changing base line and a variable direction.

The primary concerns and categories of the Newtonian-theistic man which were used to talk about man's purpose and destiny are now no longer of such significance. If the Newtonian man used the central concept of Theos to develop his theistic position we can say that atomic age man will be primarily concerned with ethos. The ethos of anything or anyone is the underlying axioms to which they conform or by which they function. The ethos is the basic assumptions in whose context the normal process of activity is carried on. Sometimes consciously, but more often unconsciously, these assumptions act as guideposts by which decisions are reached and actions defined. The ethos is the "hidden agenda," the commitments that have already been made. The ethos-man is engaged in the study of human commitments, the discussion of commitments, the endeavor to create new commitments on the horizontal plane. The sum of these commitments defines man and his destiny.

Ethos questions have already been asked about the way we think of and use the world. They have been answered in terms of an atomic frame of reference. Similar questions are here raised concerning religion and theology. The answer is given in terms of developing the ethos-man and the church then becomes a community whose task is the identifying of ethos questions concerning man and his society. Such ethos questions are:

---

[2] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Prisoner for God, p. 153.

1. By our technology we have made the world a global village.

   What sort of man lives in a global village?

   What political, economic and social structures are needed?

2. A large percentage of our population are trained in technological skills. In the former age the engineer and inventor accepted little social responsibility for their engineering. Now technology is changing the life of man -- how do we change technological education -- education in general so that concepts of social responsibility are built in?

3. In the age of rapidly increasing cybernation --

   a. How do we free people from the psychological bondage of the puritan doctrine of work.

   b. Since most employment is in service occupations how do we instill the philosophy of service to man into our education and cultural sub-systems.

   c. What is the process by which we develop the guaranteed national income?

4. How do we plan and act long range to develop new concepts of human equality, privacy and dignity?

5. In the age of great advance in molecular biology how do we develop an adequate delivery of health services? Who decides who can use some of the new breakthroughs? What sort of genetic surgery is permissible? Who can use the tenal dialysis machine? How do we now define dying and death.

6. For men who live in an atomic age with completely new presuppositions about the nature of the world we live in what changes must we make in our religious concepts, what are the new frames of reference we must develop to speak to each other about man's purpose and destiny?

These are all ethos questions.

There is no specialty that can handle them.

They are questions in the public domain.

It is my contention that the church as an institution in society must serve society by handling these questions.

This implies

1. A change in its theological frame of reference.
2. A systematic study of these questions.
3. The development of a strategy for dealing with them.
4. Education of clergy and laity alike.
5. Political astuteness in creating public awareness and action.

THE ADULT YEARS

Bernice L. Neugarten

Much has been written and said about the rapidity of social change in our society. Most commentators speak from the perspective of historical time, describing changes that have occurred and will occur in the next few decades, with chronological time marked off in terms of calendar years.

I wish to comment from a different time perspective -- that of life-time, where age is the yardstick. I wish to make a few comments, first, about the age-status system as it is changing in American society and as delineations of age groups bear upon the issues of adulthood and upon the relations between individuals in the society; and then move to a few comments about the psychological issues that preoccupy adult age-groups.

The Adult Age-Status System

In America of the future, as in all societies, age is likely to be one of the important factors in determining the ways people will behave toward each other. Five-year-olds now show deference to 10-year-olds; and despite the flood of literature in the past decade that implies the opposite, adolescents still show deference to adults; and adults, to the old.

In all societies, certain biological and social events come to be regarded as significant punctuation marks in the life-line, and to signify the transition points from one level of age-status to the next. Age-status systems emerge in which rights and rewards are differentially distributed to age groups which themselves have been socially defined.

A modern complex society is characterized by plural systems of age status that become differentiated in relation to particular social institutions. These age-status systems make use of the common index of chronological age, but they vary in the extent to which they are explicit and formal. Age-grading in a typical American school, for example, is much more formal than in the typical American family. Social age definitions may be inconsistent from one institution to the next, as in the case at present when the male is defined as adult at 18 and is eligible for military service, and when the female is adult at 18 and may marry without the consent of parents; but when neither is adult enough to vote until 21.

As the American society changes from the agrarian to the industrialized to the computerized, so also there will be continuing changes in the social definitions of age, in age norms, in expectations with regard to age-appropriate behavior, and in relations between age groups in one after another of our social institutions: in the family, in the economic system, in the political and legal system, as well as in the educational system. These changes, not all of them coherent, are the accompaniment of underlying biological, social, and economic developments in the emergent society. There has been, first of all, the growth and redistribution of the population, with the presently high proportions of the very young and the very old; and the striking increase in average longevity which itself has produced a new rhythm of life-timing and aging. Superimposed upon this changing biological base, and reflecting the dramatic changes in technology, there have come far reaching alterations in the economic system, then in the family system, alterations which have led in turn to changing relationships between age groups.

Within the institution of the family, for example, the points along the life-line at which the individual moves from "child" to "adolescent" to "adult" are easily defined. After physical maturity is reached, social age continues to be marked off by relatively clearcut biological or social events. Thus marriage marks the end of one social age period and the beginning of another; as does the appearance of the first child, the departure of children from the home, and the birth of the children's children. At each stage, the individual takes on new roles, and his prestige is altered in relation to other family members. At each of these points he may be said to occupy a new position within the age-status system of the family.

Changes in timing of the events of the family cycle have been dramatic over the past decades, as age at marriage has dropped; as children are born earlier in the marriage; and, with increased longevity, as the duration of marriage has increased.

Marriage implies adulthood within the family cycle. With the lowering of age at marriage, it may be said therefore that adulthood is occurring earlier than before. The earlier timing of adulthood is reinforced also by the fact that parenthood is occurring earlier; and to the extent that parenthood means full financial and legal responsibility for offspring, parenthood is becoming shorter, for children are being born increasingly soon after marriage, are being spaced more closely together, and are then leaving home at an earlier age. It follows that grandparenthood also comes at an earlier chronological age than in preceding generations.

The family cycle may be said to have quickened, then, as marriage, parenthood, empty nest, and grandparenthood all occur earlier now than in 1900. At the same time, widowhood tends to occur later. The trend therefore is toward a more rapid rhythm of events through most of the family cycle; then an extended interval (now some 15 to 17 years) in which husband and wife are the remaining members of the household, a period which has come to be called the period of the gerontic family. This quickened rhythm of maturity in the family is not paralleled in other institutions of our society.

Getting married, although it defines maturity within the family, is no longer synchronous with the attainment of maturity in the economic sphere, for example, as it was at earlier times. No longer does marriage signify that the legal head of the household is ready to be the breadwinner; nor does it signify that the period of his formal education and occupational training is coming to a close. With the needs of the American economy for larger and larger numbers of technical and professional workers, the length of time being devoted to education is correspondingly increased for more and more young people. There is not, however, an accompanying delay with regard to marriage, as was true in preceding generations. In 1961, for example, of all males enrolled in colleges and graduate schools, more than one out of five were married; for those aged 25 to 29, 60 per cent were married.

The accompanying phenomenon is the young wife who works to support her husband through school. The changing roles of women, but particularly the changing sex-role patterns with regard to the timing of economic maturity, are reflected in the rising proportion of young married women who are in the labor force. In 1890, only 6 per cent of married women aged 14 to 24 were working; by 1960 it was 31 per cent. While these percentages reflect marriages in which husbands are working as well as those in which husbands are still in school, they reveal in both instances not only that young wives are increasingly sharing the economic burdens of new households, but also that young women are doing so at younger and younger ages. The social age of economic maturity is being more and more frequently deferred for males; but not for females.

The new rhythms of social maturity impinge, of course, upon aspects of family life other than the division of economic responsibility between young husbands and wives. Parent-child relationships, so much a focus of concern to Americans of all ages, are influenced in many subtle ways by the fact that half of all new fathers are now under 23 and half of all new mothers, under 21. Changes in parental behavior, with fathers reportedly becoming less authoritarian and with both parents sharing more equally in tasks of homemaking and child-rearing, may reflect in part this increasing youthfulness. It is the relative youth of both parents and grandparents, furthermore, that may be contributing to the complex patterns of help between generations that are now becoming evident, including the widespread financial help that flows from parents downward to their adult children. Similarly, with more grandparents surviving per child, and with an extended family system that encompasses several generations, new patterns of child-rearing are emerging in which child-grandparent relations take on new significance.

It is of interest, in this connection, that in a recent study in which various styles of grandparenting were delineated, we found younger grandparents (those under age 65, as compared with over 65) more often following what we called the fun-seeker pattern. The fun-seeker is the grandparent whose relation to the child is characterized by informality and playfulness, who joins the child in specific activities for the specific purpose of having fun, somewhat as if he were the child's playmate. Grandchildren are viewed by these grandparents as a source of leisure activity, as an item of "consumption" rather than "production," and as a source of self-indulgence. The relationship is one in which authority lines are irrelevant, and where the emphasis is on mutuality of satisfaction.

Changing age-norms and changing relations between age-groups can, of course, be readily illustrated in the economic institutions of our society. The growth of leisure is having enormous effects upon society, but I should like to draw your attention to its effects upon different age-groups as well as upon the two sexes.

If we regard two major points, entry and exit from the labor market, then for men, the period of economic productivity has been shortening over the past decades, as both young and old are increasingly excluded from the labor market. On the one hand, unemployment is not only a teen-age phenomenon, but it is disproportionate also in men under age 25. At the other end, the proportion of men aged 65 and over who are now employed is about half the proportion employed in 1900. The removal of older men from the labor force results in an earlier onset of "economic old age."

This trend, together with increasing age restrictions in employment, has had widespread social consequences for the age-status system in America. As with teen-agers, one effect has been, of course, to delineate the group over 65 as a special age group, one with special economic and social needs. The effects have not all been in the direction of lowering the status of the aged, however. Despite the fact that a higher proportion of the aged suffer economic deprivation than in other age groups, and despite the belief that the aged are assigned a position of low status in industrialized societies, the fact is that the aged now constitute a leisured class, and the effects are not uniformly detrimental to their prestige in the society, a point to which we shall return.

The pattern of labor force participation is a very different one for women than for men. In the past fifty years changes have gone in somewhat opposite directions. The proportion of women in the labor market has not only risen dramatically, but the characteristics of women who work have changed even more strikingly. The typical woman worker is now a married woman with children; and one of every three such workers has children at home under 18.

It is the change in age distribution that is of special interest, however. Not only has the proportion of very young women in the labor force been increasing, but it is in the middle years that the change is most striking. For women aged 35 to 44 the proportion now working is over 40 per cent; and for women aged 45 to 54, it is 50 per cent. For most men, the trend has been to shorten the total number of years spent in the labor force -- for most women, the trend is in the opposite direction. Although they work fewer years than men, women's work lives are lengthening as men's work lives are shortening.

In the present context, the implication is not only that many women have become economic producers for the first time in their middle years (although this is indeed the perception of themselves that many women hold); the implication is, rather, with regard to the age-status system. The return to the labor force has brought with it for large numbers of American women, but particularly for those at higher levels of education, an increase in status that affects the relationships, not only between the sexes but between the generations within the family. It is not only the mother who works now, but also the grandmother.

I realize that these trends are likely to be upset altogether by the forces of cybernation, and that there will be less work for women as well as for men in the next 20 years. Nevertheless, changes in the timing, maturity, and post-maturity in economic terms already are so fundamental that they have led to the broad redefinitions of age groups that may be said to have emerged in America over the past 50 years as adolescents on the one hand, and the aged, on the other, have been set apart as special groups in the society.

The differences in social aging are apparent also in middle age. Lightened family responsibilities, and the taking on of new economic and civic roles now tend to coincide with the biological changes of the climacterium, producing an increasingly accentuated transition point in the lives of women. A few generations ago, with children spaced further apart, the last child married and the nest emptied, as it were, when women were in their mid-fifties. Today, this event occurs when women are in their forties, at about the same time that the menopause occurs. This is the age also when the number of women on the labor market at present takes a sharp upturn. The significance of this new transition point with regard to definitions of social age is reflected, perhaps, in the increasing frequency with which the phrase, "the middle-aged woman" is being used by sociologists, cartoonists, and other observers of the American scene to delineate a special age-sex group.

The social definition of old age, on the other hand, is more clearly delineated for men than for women, given the facts of retirement and the major change this produces in the lives of men.

The Issues of Adulthood

Having commented, if only briefly, upon the age-status system as one context in which to view the adult portion of the life-span, I should like to comment briefly upon the different constellations of social-psychological issues that face young adults, middle-aged, and old.

In a sense the minister deals with some of the same psychological issues in all adult age groups: the individual's use of experience; his structuring of the social world in which he lives; his perspectives of time; the changes in self-concept and changes in identity as he faces the successive contingencies of marriage, parenthood, career advancement and decline, retirement, widowhood, and illness.

I take it for granted that all of us here are familiar enough with the nature of adolescence and of young adulthood and with the issues involved in the transition, so that I need not dwell upon the period of young adulthood! The wide array of life problems in the young; the ways certain of our "hippie" young people move from uncommitted positions to committed, and the ways they adopt conventional or unconventional work, family, and community roles; the problems connected with military service and the struggles with conscience; the use of contraceptives and the effects of legitimate as well as illegitimate pregnancies upon both male and female occupational plans; the ways in which young men and women try to establish emotional independence from parents without the accompanying financial independence; the initial job placements and the launching of careers; the selection of appropriate adult "sponsors," whether these be faculty members who provide apprenticeship relations in graduate school training or particular business corporations where young men and women will get what we regard as a "proper" start; and the ways young men and women follow an internalized social clock that acts as a prod or a brake and that tells them they are "on time," "early," or "late" with regard to marriage, parenthood, economic independence.

I should like to focus for a few minutes upon the middle years of life, where some of our current studies are revealing a set of issues that are typically age-related and that do not seem to appear in either younger or older groups. Among the major preoccupations of mid-adulthood, as described by men and women who are presently in the forties and early fifties are these: the ways in which men rationalize their career achievements, and how, while some feel they have reached a plateau, others worry lest they are sliding and still others look ahead to better things yet to come. There is the launching of one's children into the adult world and readjusting to changes in family relationships after the children are gone; coping with decrements in energy, physical health and sexual potency; managing the changing relationship and responsibility for aging parents; and adpating to the finiteness of life-time as one faces the death of relatives and close friends.

It is apparent that middle-aged people look to their positions within different life contexts -- body, career, family -- rather than to chronological age for their primary cues in "clocking" themselves. Often there is a differential rhythm in the timing of events within these various contexts so that the cues used for placing oneself in a particular phase of the life-cycle are not always synchronized. For example, one business executive regards himself as being "on top" in his occupation and assumes all the prerogatives and responsibilities that go with seniority in that context, yet because his children are still young, he feels that he has a long way to go before completing his major goals within the family.

Women, more often than men, regard the middle years of life as a period of greater freedom for the self. It is not surprising, therefore, that many women tended to define middle age in terms of their present stage in the family cycle rather than by chronological age. Middle age is seen as beginning at about the time the youngest child reaches high school age. Energy and time which had previously been directed toward children ahd homemaking are now available for uses which can be self-determined -- which can be "inner-directed" rather than "other-directed" in focus. Some women regard this period of life as an opportunity to expand their activities or develop previously latent or dormant talents. For these women, middle-age is characterized not only by a marked change in activity, but by a major change in self-image, as well.

Men, on the other hand, tend to perceive and recognize their middle-age position in the life-line from cues received outside of the family context. The deferential behavior accorded them by junior colleagues at work in various civic and social activities; their sponsoring of younger persons for positions of responsibility; any disparity between career-expectations and career achievements, that is, whether one is "on time", in reaching career goals -- these and other observations served to trigger a heightened awareness of age.

For example, a recurrent theme of some of the men we interviewed is the close relationship between life-time and career movement. Career movement or change is viewed as feasible up to a certain age -- generally not much later than the early fifties. Thus, a man in his early forties who had gone as far as he could in his firm said that he was giving "serious thought to a change now. If I'm ever going to make a satisfactory change, I must do it now." A 47 year old trust lawyer, who had moved at age 45 from a large corporation to another law firm, remarked, "I feel I got out at the last possible moment, because at 45 it's very difficult to get another job. If you haven't made it by then, you better make it up fast, or you're stuck."

Many men regard their increased attention and concern with health problems and energy conservation to be a salient characteristic of middle age. Concern over health, however, was seldom mentioned by the women we interviewed despite the obvious signs and manifestations of the menopause during their late forties and early fifties. (It is a point worth mentioning, parenthetically, that both men and women tend to be woefully lacking in information regarding the effects -- or, more properly -- the lack of effects upon sexual functioning as well as upon physical and mental health resulting from the menopause and the related biological changes of the climacterium.) Both men and women recognized a shift in their general orientation to the body, with increased attention now being given to "body-monitoring" -- a term we used to describe the large variety of protective strategies used by middle-aged persons for maintaining the body at a given level of performance or in preparing for future decrements in function. Closer attention was focussed upon diet, rest and sleep than had been true at earlier periods; there was a shift in emphasis from a "youth-vigor" value system to one of "health-comfort-grooming."

Thus, for example a 56 year old business executive, recognizing that regular physical examinations had now become a routinized part of his life, remarked "I began to go in for semi-annual check-ups about ten years ago. When you reach this age there are various changes in blood chemistry and so on that take place without your noticing them." Or, the 45 year old attorney, "I think the physical changes occur first. Mentally you still feel young, but you begin to notice that your legs ache if you run up the stairs. You remember when they didn't. You get winded more quickly when you do physical activity, and those things all add up."

There were also indications of a changing time-perspective -- in the ways individuals orient themselves to time and personalize the phenomenon of death as they move from young adulthood to middle adulthood. The restructuring of life in terms of time-left-to live rather than time-since birth, the provision for social as well as biological heirs, "rehearsal for widowhood" that was common in women, but not in men; the awareness that time is finite -- these take on a saliency in mid-adulthood that is not as evident at earlier stages in the life-cycle.

Thus, a building contractor, aged 48, remarked: "You hear so much about deaths which seem to be premature. That's one of the changes that comes over you over the years, whereas young fellows never give it a thought."

The recognition that there is "only so much time left" was a frequent theme in the interviews. In referring to the death of a contemporary, one man, aged 48, stated: "There is now the realization that death is very real. Those things don't quite penetrate when you're in your twenties and you think that life is all ahead of you. Now you realize that those years are gone and with each passing year you are getting closer to the end of your life."

For some men and women, the death of the last surviving parent introduces a feeling of personal vulnerability. A 47 year old author, in describing her reactions, said: "Both of my parents died within the last year...and all of a sudden I have the sense of being vulnerable myself, a feeling that I didn't have before."

A final word about ministers themselves -- not in terms of the personal qualities they should have, since you are better informed on that topic than I -- but in terms of their own age. Let me make explicit one of the implications that underlies many of my comments today: that different age-groups who live together at the same moment in history have different sets of values and attitudes because of their different experiential bases -- the phenomenon that the sociologist Mannheim had in mind when he spoke of "the non-contemporaneity of the contemporaneous." Nowhere is this matter as likely to be sensitive as in the relationship between minister and parishioner, where the very nature of the relationship rests upon an ability to imagine what is motivating the next person. A young minister may be at a real disadvantage if he deals with an old person, even if he deals with a middle-aged person, just as the opposite nay also be true.

A newspaper writer recently expressed some of the feelings of a sensitive middle-aged man in the following words:

"...the realization suddenly struck me that I had become, perhaps not an old fogy but surely a middle-aged fogy.... For the train was filled with college boys returning from vacation.... They cruised up and down the aisles, pretending to be tipsy...they were boisterous, but not obnoxious; looking for fun, but not for trouble.... Yet most of the adult passengers were annoyed with them, including myself. I sat there, feeling a little like Eliot's

Prufrock, so meticulously composed, buttoned-up, bespectacled, mouth thinly set...Squaresville....

"The division between the nations, or the sexes, or the races, is not so broad and unbridgeable as the division between the generations. Here, integration of any real sort is all but impossible: for the young do not really believe in age, and the older among us do not really empathize with youth. They cannot project, and we cannot retroject.... Cannot or will not, it comes to the same thing....

"They are not as silly as they appear, and we are not as fogyish as we seem to be. But we are all trapped by our environment, the marionettes of time...."

I am not as sure as my newspaper friend that we are all locked within age-roles and that we cannot communicate across age lines. I do feel sure, however, that the typical middle-aged or the typical old person will bring with him into any face-to-face situation some such set of attitudes, and that we must be constantly aware of the great saliency of age factors as they operate in creating social and psychological issues for adults and as they operate to influence the very ministerial process itself.

INTERNSHIP FOR CLERGYMEN IN URBAN MINISTRY

A pilot program of professional training for action in environmental mental health

Western Reserve University
Cleveland College
Robert Bonthias

Description of the Program

Awareness of the mental health problems created by urban life and its structures, ability to analyze these problems, and skill in carrying out strategies to cope effectively with them are all involved in the Internship for Clergymen in Urban Ministry.

Problems of Poverty, Health, Intergroup Relations, Youth, and Aging constitute the subjects of study for this full-time, eight-month program of post-graduate training. In addition, each trainee chooses a thirty-two week Anchor Engagement with one critical urban problem. This is supplemented by many Satellite Engagements in each of the five problem areas. The raw material of these engagements is examined in the context of interdisciplinary seminars led by the Internship Staff, community specialists, and faculty of the University.

> This is a pilot project. Its purpose as a pilot project is to design, administer, and test a model curriculum for the post-graduate training of professional persons who influence the urban environment and hence the mental health of its people.

The training which the Internship Program provides is a discipline of urban analysis and strategy geared to the unique professional role of the intern. The key idea is that mental health depends upon the ability of leaders to deal structurally as well as individually with problems which affect mental health. Supervision by organizational experts is coupled with Pastor Counselors who assist the interns in relating sociological and psychological understanding to their functions as ministers, priests, and rabbis. Emphasis is placed upon sensitization to urban problems, ways of analyzing them, actual experience with strategies to cope with these problems and help people affected by them, role analysis of the profession and its institutions, and use of community resources.

Formulation of the Original Design

For several years Western Reserve University through its continuing education division, Cleveland College, worked with clergy of different faiths in short-term programs. These programs included education in the power structure of Cleveland, introductions to critical urban issues in metropolis, and orientation in the uses of community resources for counseling and education. These programs used faculty and community experts from the disciplines of psychology, psychiatry, social work, sociology, political science and economics. Some of them were carried out in cooperation with the Cleveland Council of Churches.

One was done with clergy of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths together with leaders of business and labor. In addition to such programs, Cleveland College has played a supportive role in developing programs for individual congregations, enabling clergy to educate their people in crucial areas of social problems, and the mental health implications of social change.

Out of this activity rose an interfaith clergy advisory committee to explore further ideas of clergy education. No doubt the energy and interest of Dean Allan F. Pfleger was the catalyst here. Dean Pfleger involved key faculty, the chairmen of the Psychology and the Sociology-Anthropology departments and the Dean of the School of Applied Social Sciences and advisors here. He played off ideas with these clergy and faculty, finally coming up with a program and a likely funding organization. The program was called, "Internship for Clergymen in Urban Mental Health." The funding organization to which it was submitted, bought it: National Institute of Mental Health, a United States Government division of the Institutes of Health in Washington, D.C. NIMH funded the program for $417,000 for a five year period (one year of planning, four years of training). We are just finishing the first training year. There will be three more: October to June, 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70. The program was funded in July, 1965. Dean Pfleger did not find his director until late that year. Robert H. Bonthius arrived on the scene March 1, 1966 to take up directorship. Dr. Bonthius worked alone for the balance of the planning year (March to July, 1966) during which time he developed the design, advertised the program, and secured the first group of interns, who began October 24, 1966. An Associate Director and an Administrative Assistant were found during the summer of 1966.

Assumptions Underlying the Original Design

a. Clergy need to understand and cope with the multiple factors in the environment which affect the normal development of the individual in our cities.

b. The changes now taking place in metropolis threaten the social as well as the psychological survival of its members, so that new ways must be found to bring about desirable social changes in the environment.

c. Training such leadership requires interdisciplinary study that is directly related to and involved in the problems themselves. It must be a participatory type of education which uses academic and community resources to sharpen perceptions and develop skills.

d. The clergy is an excellent profession to use a vehicle of training because the clergy head institutions closer to the people than professionals of any other social institution outside the family, because clergy are obviously increasingly involved in trying to bring about social changes, and because Cleveland College has found that clergy respond to continuing education.

e. The curriculum model developed and tested at Cleveland College can be devised with a view to being used by universities in other metropolitan areas both for clergy training in urban ministry and for the training of other professions whose leadership in social change is needed if cities are to be humanized.

Changes Made in the Design

Briefly, these changes and developments may be summarized as follows:

a. Constituency. Ten instead of twenty clergy were allowed by NIHM for the first training year; fifteen will be allowed each of the remaining three training years.

b. Curriculum. Seminars of two unique types were added in preparation for the first training group: Personal Learning Group (weekly sensitivity experience) and Theological Reflection Seminar (weekly training in theological reflection on environmental change and social problems). Other seminars were developed more than they had been in the original design: Interdisciplinary Analysis Seminar (weekly focussing on the specific problem within the unit -- Poverty, Health, Intergroup Relations, Youth, or Aging), Psychological Impacts Seminar (weekly focussing on the relation between the environmental aspects of the problem and the individuals in that environment), Satellite Engagements (brief two-to-eight-hour exposures to actual situations and directly to persons involved in the problem under analysis), Anchor Engagements (thirty-two-week long analysis and strategy around one specific problem in the city). A monograph, Model for Ministry, was built into the program so that each intern would produce an interdisciplinary analysis and strategy for his ministry following the training program, the monograph to specify also the theological basis for this ministry and the unique role of the clergyman himself, his constituency, his denomination, and ecumenical agencies).

c. Title. Because of continuous misinterpretations, thinking that this was a program in clinical training or counseling, the public name given the program was changed to, "Internship for Clergymen in Urban Ministry" ("mental health" being taken out of the title but included in the sub-title: "A pilot program of professional training for action in environmental mental health").

Objectives of the Present Program and Needs They Seek to Meet

There are six training goals:

(1) To sensitize clergymen in depth to problems of the metropolis. This is essentially a goal of increased sensitization including the development of responsive elements such as interest in listening to others, feeling what they feel, being open to new and different attitudes, outlooks, orientations, and value-systems. The capacity for continuing exposure to metrpolis is regarded as a prerequisite for analyzing and strategizing problems.

(2) To develop in clergy a discipline of analyzing urban problems. This analysis is a way of getting systematically at the facts of a problematic situation in metropolis (something experienced as an ill, a dislocation, an injustice or imbalance, a danger or a threat, something that is felt to be an unrealized possibility, a need, or a potential benefit in human relations). It consists of (a) an analysis of the situation in terms of its conditions, (b) its structures, (c) its actors, and (d) the goals of these actors. The ability to analyze problems of the social environment is a discipline which affects the total ministry of the clergy: preaching, teaching, counseling and community organization.

(3) To teach clergymen how to strategize with regard to urban problems. This training goal is based upon the analytic discipline mentioned above, but

it is separable because it is the outcome of sociological-psychological theological reflection upon the particular problem. Strategizing involves both the capacity to assess alternative possibilities of changing an urban condition and the rationale for doing so. The rationale is inescapably "theological" in that the clergyman, like every religious person, must be convinced of a relationship between the religious tradition and the particular problem. Every pastor is inevitably faced with the need to "have a reason for the strategy within him."

(4) To teach clergy more about identifying and utilizing the resources of metropolis to help meet human needs. While this goal is connected with the goals of analysis and strategy already stated, it is identified because of the critical role of clergy as "brokers" in the community, that is, facilitators of encounter, dialogue and cooperation among persons of different disciplines and expertise who have contributions to make to the resolution of a given problem.

(5) To enable clergymen to become more effective workers with their constituencies for environmental change. This goal has several components: understanding how social change occurs, skill in constituency mobilization, the uses of conflict and consensus procedures in effecting social change, development of management skills, ability to cope with interpersonal difficulties which block constituency organization, and skills in communication and feedback procedures.

(6) To help clergy clarify their professional roles, and the roles of their religious institutions in effecting urban change. This goal includes development of ability to identify and interpret role conflicts, ability to relate theological understandings of mission to institutional realities, and increased clarity regarding relationships of local-metropolitan, denominational-ecumenical, religious-secular, and clergy-laity roles in urban change.

The needs these goals seek to meet are suggested in the goals themselves. In general, we seek to prepare men through development toward these goals for more effective service as change-agents in urban society. The program is not an inner city program but is concerned with the entire spectrum of metropolitan life from the inner city to the exurbia. Clergy in the program are from all sections of the metropolis.

Evaluation of the Program

In cooperation with the Urban Training Center in Chicago and the Metropolitan Urban Service Training Facility in New York City, we have designed a process-outcome study of twenty-eight months duration to test changes in behavior, skills, and attitudes in the interns going through programs of approximately the same length. The research staff for this work has now been appointed, and it begins its work this month (June 1967). A part of the research program will consist of the design, administration, and review of pre-test, post-test, and follow-up test devices (eight months following the end of training) in each of the three programs for the persons trained in the 1967-68 and 1968-69 years. In preparation for this research three test instruments have already been designed and are being used experimentally. Period evaluation by the interns themselves of each component of the present program are taped to provide additional material for use in the formulation of relevant testing devices and the development of other forms of process-outcome research.

EMERGING DIRECTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Allan F. Pfleger

I am here tonight because I believe in the Church and the servanthood of the clergy. I believe the clergyman, if he will, and as no other professional person can, is able to give to all mankind the wisdom and moral sensitivity essential to temper human intelligence if mankind is to survive the chaotic mess he has created which renders him meaningless despite his technical miracles. The growing preoccupation of universities and colleges with the discovery of knowledge to the exclusion of the general or liberal education of students is resulting in a depersonalization of the individual in our college campuses. It may be that this is heavily responsible for the drinking, sex orgies, and dope addiction among many sensitive students who struggle against the impersonal approach of the "knowledge factory." Great unrest is also seen among faculty attempting to maintain personal meaning within a system every day more concerned with the achievement of something defined as "the national purpose" and the concrete rewards that go along with that objective. One may well ask, is there a danger that our colleges and universities will exist to serve the national purpose to the exclusion of the individual? Probably not. Our religious heritage has deeply etched into our subconscious, a belief in the worth of each individual which we have incorporated into our institutional life. Still, there is a persistent force emanating from the very technology we created, which is forcing individuals and individual institutions to sacrifice themselves to its further creation. Let us examine some of the trends in society which are requiring individual institutions of higher education to sacrifice their autonomy in order to meet the demands of a society with an insatiable desire for the results of new knowledge.

According to the U.S. Office of Education Directory, higher education is comprised of about 1,500 institutions; 644 junior colleges, 792 four year institutions, 455 which offer work through the master's level, 223 which grant the doctorate, and 23 which are unclassified. Of these, 405 are under state control, 357 under local governments, 507 private and non-denominational, 483 Protestant, 361 Roman Catholic, and eight Jewish. No other nation even approaches us in the number and diversity of institutions of higher education. Beginning on the departmental level, we have made a "watchword" of independence. But perhaps too often we assume that anything we do in the name of higher education must necessarily be worthwhile. Because our institutions do have high purposes and yield intangible benefits to society, we dislike to use anything like the balance sheets of a business enterprise to appraise our efforts. It is frequently said that our institutions suffer from "university syndrome" by trying to do too many things which results in spreading our resources too thinly. As a result, we do nothing really well. The current controversy over Parsons College is an indication. The college increased its enrollment from 200 to 5,300 in 11 years. Despite the fact that President Roberts reduced the number of courses taught at Parsons, raised tenured faculty salaries, introduced a system of team teaching, cut construction costs and expanded plant 20 fold, behind this facade there were so many chronic weaknesses that the North Central Association recently took away its accreditation.

Whatever their strengths and weaknesses, institutions of higher education are being affected to a degree as great as any other institution which society has created for the achievement of its goals and aspirations. The greatest force acting upon higher education is the knowledge explosion and the insistent demands of society that knowledge be used to solve problems. With each application of knowledge, there appears the expectation that there will be additional successes immediately. What previous generations called miracles are expected to be routine accomplishments today. As an example, recall how after the victory over polio, there immediately appeared the public expectation that the cancer problem would be solved forthwith and that mental disease would yield to science. In another field, the so-called "Poverty Program" is the political expression of the public expectation that a society which had developed the knowledge and skill to produce our incredibly high standard of living can also produce the knowledge and skill to eradicate the age-old blight of ignorance and poverty. Because higher education has produced knowledge and skill, it is expected to produce more and more of both of these commodities in shorter and shorter time periods.

Indeed, higher education has clearly become part of the national policy. This insatiable demand for knowledge and its immediate application has given rise to what Clark Kerr calls the "Federal Grant Universities." This relatively small group of universities, graduates a large percentage of Ph.D.'s and has received an overwhelming proportion of Federal grant monies in recent years. This is calling for a change in higher education. Its impact on research activities and financial expenditures of this relatively small number of universities has been great. The repercussions for other universities and particularly the liberal arts college, have been significant but not yet fully apprehended. Kerr concludes that by and large the results of this revolution have been deterioration in undergraduate education at a considerable number of colleges and universities. The new emphasis on research, grantsmanship, and lighter teaching loads has been felt in most liberal arts campuses. There is an emerging tendency for these colleges to move in the direction of the university through increased emphasis on research, but generally with much less adequate facilities for research than are available at the university. It is also clear, that as universities tend more and more to neglect undergraduate teaching, the liberal arts colleges have a competitive opportunity if they can offer greater educational opportunities to their undergraduate students to justify their high tuition charges.

As education becomes more important to the general welfare, higher education has become more complicated, expensive, and interrelated. Entrenched views of institutional autonomy must be given up to avoid the need to increase the price we must pay for adequate education as we attempt to improve both its quality and effectiveness as a coordinated instrumentality, serving the best interests of the nation as a whole. This does not imply that education should be subservient to political needs. But in our free society, it becomes increasingly evident, that important forms of competition be limited, if chaos is to be avoided. Is there a valid reason for exempting educational institutions from this requirement? It seems choice can no longer be disjointed laissez-faire. The only real chance remaining is for institutional and associational leaders to get together to exercise major initiative in the reorganization of higher education, or stand aside while others assume the role. What steps are being taken to create the structures needed to allow institutions of higher education to serve the ever increasing number of students with excellent education and still maintain reasonable costs and a degree of individuality? This is preoccupying educators throughout the country.

There is a healthy trend evident on the part of ever increasing numbers of individual colleges and universities to examine their own reasons for being; to assess their current strengths and weaknesses and envision what each hopes to be and can expect to be in the decades ahead. Criteria must be developed for judging teaching performance. Curriculum must be examined to see what should be disregarded and whether what is taught is more the product of historic accretion than of contemporary design.

Planning is also proceeding on the state and regional levels. With the tremendous costs immediately ahead in the rapid expansion and improvement of higher education, we simply can no longer afford blunders in the location of institutions, wasteful duplication of programs, unplanned and piece meal local responses to wider needs, and the general lack of unity which has characterized our collective endeavors in the past. To plan wisely and decisively, we must be guided by judgments based on objective knowledge of the relations between form and function in higher education. The State of California probably has the most fully integrated master plan of any state. Its Coordinating Council for Higher Education has prepared and begun implementing a plan for the "development, expansion, and integration of facilities, curriculum, standards in higher education, in junior colleges, state colleges, the University of California, and other institutions of the state, to meet the needs of the state during the next ten years and thereafter."

The National Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation at Princeton, New Jersey, in Spring of 1962 is an indication of the trend toward college federation movements. Directors and Trustees of 24 federations, representing 223 colleges and universities, met to discuss principles and guidelines for organization, the shared use of consultants, the question of incorporation and the nature of board membership. They also discussed ways to discover and initiate projects together. They identified 32 activities, mostly academic in character, as potentially appropriate for cooperative effort. The constant questions before the group in several meetings which followed the 1962 meeting were: (1) Where are we now? (2) Where do we go from here? (3) How do we get there?

It is interesting to note that in 1964 Catholic University of America held a Workshop on College and University. The objectives were: (1) to give participants a better appreciation of the nature and scope of cooperative arrangements in higher education through the use of representative examples of such undertakings, and (2) to give guidance in emphasis, planning, and methodology in establishing, administering, and evaluating cooperative programs.

The most prevalent patterns emerging are multilateral arrangements among a small number of institutions characterized by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. This consists of ten colleges in four states no more than 200 miles apart. Its purposes are increased effectiveness and lower costs. Their programs provide, in varying degrees, increased research opportunities for faculty members and enhanced educational opportunities for a few students. The Association has been a very effective force in raising money for the colleges, both through the private and public sectors of our economy.

Research is also beginning to show cooperative arrangements. The Graduate Research Center of the Southwest is an example. The purposes are: (1) encouraging, promoting, and arranging, through formal and informal arrangements, for research and teaching; (2) the interchange of staff and advanced students among the universities of the Southwest.

All of these efforts show trends and directions in higher education to meet the research and public service demands pressing very badly upon it. These are steps which allow for a good deal of localized and independent decision making, but which attempt to hold down costs and improve quality through the kind of interdependence which will allow for shared resources. This is essential for survival.

If a few "Federal Grant Universities" continue in a transcendent position, there is real danger that education will continue to become more and more depersonalized as the "knowledge factory" become increasingly preoccupied with the discovery of knowledge to the exclusion of teaching. Although much lip service is given to the concept of diversity, in practice there is an indiscriminate trend to imitate the prestigious model of the university. Popular pressures build up to convert junior colleges to senior colleges, to have four year institutions add graduate schools. And in the scramble, unit costs go up and quality gets diluted.

Before smaller institutions rush to follow blindly the university model, they should examine the ultimate form it seems to be taking. A look at the university of the future is seen in The University in Transition, by James A. Perkins, President of Cornell. This was just published by Princeton Press. Perkins' credentials are impeccable. The names of the governmental and advisory bodies on which he serves read like a catalogue of great problems for a course in Contemporary Civilization. He informs us that the distinctive feature of the American university is its commitment, not only to the accumulation and transmission of knowledge, but also to its application as a public service. By public service he means, essentially, service to the national society and its government. Perkins may be called a rationalist or a gnostic; for him, all knowledge is a product of "reason" and human good is an emanation from knowledge. He seems not to see that there may be precious forms of knowledge, possibilities of human study and learning, worthy of a great university's concern, which simply are not products of "research" and which do not fall reasonably within the purview of most American (or Greek) academicians' notions of reason. Perkins is the first public expression I have encountered of a powerful trend among those members of the academic establishment who would streamline the whole academic curriculum so that it can more readily serve the interests of research and public service. In his opinion, "for the student who wants to specialize" -- clearly the university student as distinct from the ordinary college student -- liberal education will have to be provided either by the secondary school or by a "special program that includes liberal along with professional studies -- or a combination of both." Insofar as students are concerned, he says that if they need a sense of security that comes from being a member of a smaller, tighter community, "they should not come to the university."

According to Daniel Bell in his recent book, The Reforming of General Education (Columbia University Press), he sees the university described by Perkins and Kerr as producing an American who, within the range of his specialty, will be trained to be methodical, exact, and systematic. Outside of his professional range, he will be rather clumsy and impressionable, likely to be opinionated in a speculative way, but where something is to be done, curiously indecisive, ready to place the burden of obligation on someone else who can supply more "informed" judgment. The impression Bell leaves is that whatever may be their importance the academic leaders are unprepared for the moral roles that have been thrust upon them.

In the Winter 1966-1967 issue of the American Scholar, Kenneth B. Clark, of CCNY, published an article entitled "Intelligence, the University, and Society." He raises the question as to whether human intelligence as traditionally defined offers any reliable assurance of human survival. In examining the university and society, he concludes that our gods are the gods of Intelligence, Science, and Technology. These gods have, of course, powerful priests and apostles. Their true believers are so abject, obsequious, and worshipful that these omnipotent and omniscient gods will protect and save them and enrich their lives. But there remains the growing suspicion that these gods are fickle and treacherous. They promise and they taunt. They fulfill and they tantalize. They dare men to question their power. Man now emerges as a victorious prisoner of his own intelligence. As he rockets to the moon, he plans the futility of protection from nuclear devastation on earth.

The recent report of the Danforth Commission on "Church Sponsored Higher Education in the United States" published by the American Council on Education, makes it clear that the 817 colleges and universities affiliated with 64 different religious bodies must also give up individual autonomy and seek organizational patterns, perhaps along ecumenical lines, if they hope to survive the financial crises they are now facing. Many college administrators and trustees say that their budgets for the academic year 1966-1967, when placed against the relatively small reserve funds at most such institutions, are stunning. "Frightening" is how one trustee described the outlook recently. In light of this, it seems hard to justify the operation of four Presbyterian colleges in Iowa, five United Presbyterian institutions in Missouri, nine Methodist colleges in North Carolina, including two brand new ones, and three Catholic colleges for women in Milwaukee. But there is, on the other hand, an excellent pattern of interinstitutional cooperation in church sponsored higher education which church educators might examine more fully. The University of Waterloo in Ontario has a constellation of Anglican, Roman Catholic, United Church, and Mennonite colleges surrounding it. The University and the colleges integrate their offerings, share faculty, libraries, and laboratories.

The National Catholic Education Association, will publish a study late this summer based on interviews with some 1,500 faculty members and administrators at more than 100 Catholic campuses. The study will urge the need to do away with the unnecessary drain in manpower and money resulting from senseless duplication of programs and facilities. The study also calls for more joint faculty appointments, student exchanges, and shared facilities. It urges similar cooperation with Protestant and secular institutions.

The Baptist Education Study Task appointed in 1966 is attempting to provide a definition of Southern Baptist goals in higher education and to produce guidelines on academic freedom and faculty quality. This BEST report, which promises a clear stand on federal aid, will be published in September. It should make important reading for those of us interested in the evaluation of church sponsored higher education.

So one sees the same trends and directions in church sponsored higher education as are visible in secular education. Perhaps it is presumptuous of me to point out my hope that church sponsored higher education will seriously evaluate the abdication of moral responsibility by the university and continue to study how one directs intelligence and intelligent young people to the task of solving the tragedy of moral erosion. Is it in the national interest to follow a path to self destruction by the unrestricted application of technology? Or, is it in the national interest to educate young people to value commitment and social sensitivity above mere social success? This is a vital point of conflict in higher education.

In "The Face of Theological Education Today," Roger Hazelton points out that there are about 21,000 students enrolled in 127 accredited and associate member schools of the American Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada; 84% are in professional degree programs and 16% in graduate programs. He sees a similar set of underlying problems existing in theological education as exist in other institutions of higher education. If clergy educators are to strengthen their position in the educational hierarchy these must be examined.

First, there is probably too much diversity in the kinds of theological education available. Schools range in size from student bodies of less than a half dozen to more than 2,000 in a few southern denominational seminaries. In general, the large majority have enrollments ranging from 300 to 600 (Andover-Newton, Princeton, Yale, Union). One should also bear in mind that by 1980 over 80% of all students in higher education will be enrolled in public, not private, institutions. Further, enrollments in seminaries are not holding their own against such indices of growth as the increases in general population, church membership, and the amazing growth in colleges and universities. All of this, of course, results in too many schools competing for too few students. It forces administrators to concentrate on survival rather than excellence and confusion and discontent results in the minds of faculty and students.

Unfortunately, quality and financing go hand in hand. Theological education simply must have a more adequate financial base. It is interesting to note that higher education in the United States receives about 50% of its income from government and foundations, while theological education gets slightly less than 2%. When one considers this against the costs of theological education which doubled between 1940-1950; doubled again between 1950-1960, and is still mounting at a phenomenal rate, it is indeed "shocking." Either the larger denominations will have to increase their giving (which they can well afford) or some realistic position is going to have to be taken on federal and state aid. Individual efforts by individual schools to improve the quality and financing of their programs, no matter how excellent they are when considered singly, simply will not do the job.

Perhaps theological schools could benefit by a detailed study of the movement toward interinstitutional cooperation being developed on the local, state, and regional levels of our society. Maybe something like a Princeton Conference needs to be called along ecumenical lines so that all theological schools can jointly consider such questions as: (1) Where is clergy education now? (2) Where should it go? (3) How does it get there?

Such a conference might result in a move toward federation and a more unified attack on the common problems confronting theological education. Instead of every institution working piecemeal on every problem, perhaps each school might be willing to sacrifice some of its autonomy to devote its attention to the examination and evaluation of a single problem. No one institution has the resources to solve them all.

In such a setting, individual research could examine such questions as: How does one educate clergymen to grapple effectively with the maladjustment to the realities of life in the contemporary church and the wider world? How does one educate the clergyman to cope with avowed ecumenical ideals and the realities of the denomination? How does one make the seminary, "the intellectual center of church life?" What pilot educational models should be developed and tested as promising the best possible education for the clergyman in contemporary society? How does one resolve the financial problems of theological education? I am sure there are many others.

All of these trends are causing considerable unrest in higher education. As each individual institution attempts to evluate its program and seeks to maintain its own autonomy or individuality as it relates itself to the total good, a tension is created in the minds of administrators and faculty which is reflected in the student body. The conflict is age old, but the rapidity of our growth makes it more intense. It occurs between those who seek immediate accommodation to the requirements a larger society imposes and those who would maintain the status quo. In the American College and University, Frederick Rudolph has said, "Resistance to fundamental reform was ingrained in the American collegiate and university tradition, as over 300 years of history has demonstrated.... Except on rare occasions, the historic policy of the American college and university was drift, reluctant accommodation, belated recognition that while no one was looking, change had in fact, taken place." Because of the job it must do, it can no longer be complacent. So complex are the demands of society that each institution or group of institutions must decide whether they wish to be destroyed by a system characterized by diversification, decentralization, local autonomy, and free competition or seek unifying principles which will enable them to survive individually and collectively.

Indeed, if there is anything to be learned from looking at the trends in higher education, it is, "United we stand -- divided we fall."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Patillo, Manning M., Jr., MacKenzie, Donald M., Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Wilson, Logan, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Journals

Clark, Kenneth B., "Intelligence, the University and Society," American Scholar, Winter, 1966-1967, pp. 23-32.

Glass, Bentley, "What Man Can Be," Educational Record, Spring, 1967, pp. 101-109.

Hazelton, Roger, "The Face of Theological Education Today," Educational Record, Summer, 1965, pp. 217-222.

Kolb, William L., "The Disciplines in Liberal Arts Education," *Educational Record*, Spring, 1967, pp. 164-171.

Newspaper Articles

"Higher Education Bureau Administers 29 Programs with Budget of $1.4 Billion," The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 22, 1967, p. 7.

"Government Seeks Proposals for Policy Research Center," The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 22, 1967, p. 7.

"Parsons Loses Accreditation," The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 9, 1967, p. 1.

"Parsons College Story," The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 9, 1967, p. 4.

"San Francisco Students Run Own College," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. I, No. 3, p. 1, 1967.

"4 Views on Higher Education's Role in Cities," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. I, No. 3, p. 3, 1967.

"Joint Efforts Asked of Catholic Colleges," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. I, No. 10, p. 1, 1967.

"Catholic University: Priests in the Picket Line," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. I, No. 12, p. 1, 1967.

"5 More States Raise College Appropriations," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. I, No. 12, p. 8, 1967.

"Pennsylvania Weighs New Private College Aid Plan," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. I, No. 14, p. 3, 1967.

"Church-State Issue Troubles Baptists; Result of 2-Year Study Due Soon," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. I, No. 14, p. 5, 1967.

SEMINAR FOR YOUNG PASTORS

Division of Continuing Education

Board of Christian Education
of the United Presbyterian Church USA

John Van Zanten

Description of the Program

Each year twenty-four seminars for young pastors are held for United Presbyterian ministers, three, four, and five years beyond ordination. The first year seminar covers a nine day period and has four leaders. The second year seminar covers eight days with three leaders. The third year seminar covers five days, with the wives of the pastors invited, and with three leaders. The pastors each pay a moderate registration fee and make a contribution to a common travel pool. The bulk of the expense for leadership, board and room, is carried by the Board of Christian Education.

In a brief statement developed by the Division of Continuing Education, it is suggested that within the first few years of a man's pastorate, it becomes desirable for him to have an opportunity to take a significant portion of time away from his work to reflect on what he is doing, and in company of others in a like situation to examine the meaning of his vocation, to face whatever questions have arisen, to check the goals that have been sought, and to share problems, doubts, and frustrations.

The Division of Continuing Education insists that there be no theological "line" offered to the participants. It is important that the pastors understand that no one is trying to sell them anything. The leaders of the seminars are chosen on the basis of their knowledge and experience, particularly as pastors, and even more on the basis of their ability to understand people and to lead them in serious and open discussion.

The seminars take place at colleges, universities, and retreat centers. The number of participants is held at twenty which is considered optimum for free discussion.

Formulation of the Original Design

The design for this program of seminars for young pastors was developed by the General Secretary of the Board of Christian Education about the year 1955. Following the decision of the General Secretary, a series of experimental seminars was held during the years from 1956 until 1960. Out of these experiments the original design emerged.

Assumptions Underlying the Original Design

1. To be effective in their work, young pastors need to continue their intellectual development.

2. Ministers as "persons" need the support and expression of concern of the church at large.

3. Short term (10 day) seminars can significantly stimulate interest in study and also offer support to pastors.

4. Leaders for the seminars ought to be influential men in the denomination. (The "big-name" church leaders.)

Changes Made in the Design

1. Seminars are now held for shorter periods of time (5 to 9 days), because it has been found that an effective job can be done within these shorter limits of time and money is saved.

2. The leadership of the seminars has been changed from "big-name" persons to specialists in particular fields of study who are capable of flexibility in personal relationships.

3. Recent years have witnessed a gradual and experimental shift from the retreat center to the university environment.

4. As the years have passed, a clarification of the curriculum has taken place as follows: a. the first year -- "Rethinking the Ministry"; b. the second year -- "Communication"; c. the third year -- "The Context of Ministry".

5. A growing encouragement of the leaders of the seminars to improvise and innovate in light of their own training, experience, and personal insight.

6. There is ongoing and continual change in design, leadership, and objectives in the light of the growing number of ministers undergoing serious vocational crises.

Objectives of the Present Program Design and Needs They Seek to Meet

1. The development of a new "practical theology", for want of a better term. Such a discipline seeks to enable the minister to integrate, not only intellectually, but emotionally at the "gut level", the resources of sociology, psychology, and other relatively new disciplines, with the more traditional disciplines of theological education. The purpose of this endeavor is to help the minister to relate to the present world in which he ministers.

2. The development of a far-reaching, firmly established, system of support for ministers which avoids the "hidden agenda" of using him for institutional and other promotional purposes. This approach is followed in order to help him overcome a sense of isolation and the loss of direction found in the experience of so many ministers today.

3. The establishment of a process by which the minister is enabled to discover the inadequacies in his training and background and is offered suggestions for remedial steps.

4. The program seeks to move increasingly into ecumenical continuing education for ministers, not in the interest of keeping up with the ecumania of the day, but because of a growing awareness of the profound spiritual and pro-

fessional impoverishment which we suffer because of our denominational separateness.

5. The creation of an increasingly intensive training for the 75 to 100 leaders of the seminars. An educational operation of this size requires time, money, brains and energy far beyond the resources of a handful of "headquarters" persons. Increasingly the leadership of the seminars is becoming decentralized and is shifting into the hands of the leaders who are scattered across the country. The Board staff become consultants. The staff calls together the leaders, raises the important issues with them, propounds questions and procedures, and listens to what is said by the leaders. It is becoming recognized that the recruitment, training, and trusting of leaders is a vital part of this enterprise. The key to the effectiveness of this program lies in the quality of the leadership.

Evaluation of Our Program

1. At the close of the seminar each participant is requested to analyze and evaluate the event. Such questions are asked as: What were your expectations in coming? What elements or aspects of the seminar seemed most profitable to you for ministry? In what ways could the seminar have been more effective? What suggestions would you care to make concerning curriculum, faculty, location, worship, methodology, etc.? Changes in the future of individual seminar groups and in the overall structure of the program have been made in line with these evaluations.

2. Each leader is asked to fill out an evaluation form at the conclusion of the seminar.

3. These evaluation forms and other descriptive materials are currently being studied by the Office of Study and Research of our Board of Christian Education.

4. These same materials will be studied later this year by the Temporary Commission on Continuing Education of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church USA.

THE TOWER ROOM SCHOLARS PROGRAM

Union Theological Seminary
Richmond, Virginia

Connolly C. Gamble, Jr.

Description of the Program

Successive groups of eight to ten persons each are invited to spend twelve-day periods in residence during the academic year as Tower Room Scholars. In thirteen groups during 1966-67 were 110 persons, most of whom were pastors, but the groups included also seven staff members (a woman and two laymen among them) from the Board of Christian Education, three world missionaries on furlough, a military chaplain, a Veterans Administration hospital chaplain, a Church Extension staff member, and a Presbyterian Survey editor. Three United Presbyterian pastors took part this year, by invitation.

Each participant selects a project for study in the library, where he has a private study facility. Subjects for individual study are diverse, the primary requirement being that material must be available in the library to sustain the inquiry. Bibliographic assistance is rendered by the faculty in those instances where needed.

Once a day the group of resident scholars comes together with a member of the faculty to relate recent developments in theology to congregational life and pastoral care, and share insights into the doctrine and mission of the church. Thus the program offers opportunity for individual study and for group experience on a deep level.

Tower Room Scholars live in a seminary dormitory and eat in the commons, where they may talk with students and faculty as they wish.

From funds provided by a benefactor, the seminary meets the expenses of tuition, room, and board. The pastor's congregation is asked by the seminary to defray his travel expenses, and this is done in almost every instance. In ten years there have been 887 Tower Room Scholars.

Formulation of the Original Design

In connection with graduate research, several hundred ministers (alumni and other constituents of this seminary) were questioned about their needs to study, analyze, reflect, and learn from experience. Their responses were worked into a design that combined (1) guided study at home, (2) intensive study on campus, (3) contacts with faculty and students in seminars, in the dormitory, and in the dining room. The Union Seminary Faculty in 1951 pledged its resources to each student enrolling here, joining him in development of a lifetime program of continuing education, wherever his career should lead. The Tower Room Scholars Program was conceived as an integral component of that lifetime masterplan.

Assumptions Underlying the Original Design

1. The minister needs to engage in systematic study on a sustained basis.

2. He needs an adequate personal library to support systematic study.

3. He needs to supplement his own library with guides and books on loan.

4. He needs to combine his systematic home study with occasional intensive study in a residential program.

5. He needs both intellectual stimulation and opportunity to share questions and problems with both his peers and seminary professors, to correlate actual experience and theoretical understanding.

6. He will learn to view in different perspective his ministry as a result of his detachment for a brief period, in a changed environment, with time for absorption, integration, application, and practice, in the intimate and constant association of a small community.

Changes Made in the Design

1. The group has been increased from four to eight in gradual steps. Our aim has been to enlarge the number who benefit, without reducing significantly the individual impact of the program. Present size seems optimum.

2. The closing hour has been moved forward from 4:00 p.m. on Friday to 9:15 a.m. the same day. Most of the participants are pastors, facing pulpit responsibilities on Sunday after their return. Their anxiety seems to mount steadily on Friday, and a final conference is now held early that morning so that they may be en route home by 9:30.

3. Daily conferences with a faculty member were originally announced at the outset of the resident period with attendance expected by all participants. For several years attendance was put on a voluntary basis, and it was found that some elected to miss these conferences. Now we have resumed the original practice, without apology, believing that these daily conferences are important to balance the individual study engagements of each man.

Objectives of the Present Program Design and Needs They Seek to Meet

1. The ultimate objective is to encourage and enable the whole Church as the people of God to fulfill its ministry to and for the world.

2. The proximate objective is to encourage and enable ministers to think theologically and act responsibly in ministry in the rapidly changing world.

3. The specific objectives are (1) to continue the education of the ministry beyond formal schooling, in special or general disciplines; (2) to supplement the education obtained in formal schooling, in courses that cannot be provided or were not provided; (3) to initiate the education of the ministry in new problems, changed situations, and unique circumstances; (4) to reconstruct motivation, stereotypes, concepts, and patterns which have been faultily learned, or outmoded by changing circumstances; and (5) to rehabilitate the person by encouragement to gain or regain wholeness.

The needs they seek to meet are (1) to understand the meanings of the rapidly changing world; (2) to understand the role of ministers in this world; (3) to gain clearer theological knowledge and insight; (4) to increase competence in communication; and (5) to grow as a person.

Evaluation of Our Program

Each participant has been asked to analyze and evaluate the Tower Room Scholars Program. Less than five of the 887 participants have failed to provide such analysis and evaluation in the ten years of the program. Changes in design as indicated above, and minor adjustments as well, have been made in light of the individual evaluations.

A fulltime director of continuing education has tried to be a careful observer of the participants, meeting with each group three times in the twelve days, and maintaining sensitivity to their judgments whether expressed or inarticulate.

This program has been included by our request in the pilot evaluation conducted through the Ministry Studies Board, alongside two other residential programs of continuing education for ministers. At this writing the results have not been available.

RELATING OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION

Edgar W. Mills

The evaluator of a program is simply trying to find out how good a program it has been. But the phrase "How good a program" may mean different things to different people. The program director and the evaluator thus must define rather carefully what is acceptable as indicating that the program was a good one.

What Do You Mean by "A Good Program"?

Specifically, there are three broad meanings to the question "How good a program was it?" First, the program plans may have been well carried out. Second, the program may have brought certain advantages to its sponsoring institution. Third, the program may have achieved the change goals for which it was designed. These three indicators of "goodness" may be termed Administrative goals, Sponsor benefits, and Change goals. I want to discuss the first two before spending the bulk of this paper on the third.

Administrative Goals: These include such matters as a smooth-running schedule, the meeting of expenses, comfortable accommodations, and successful engagement of special speakers. If the program is carried off as planned, if it included all it was intended to, and if it went well, then administratively it is judged to be a good program.

This is not so obvious a point as it may seem. Consider the following list of "Operational Objectives" of a program of continuing education. These are all administrative goals:

1. To bring a (small) group of ministers into dialogue with each other on many subjects and at different levels of intensity.

2. To engage these ministers in fruitful dialogue with representative members of a theological faculty....

3. To expose these ministers to seminary students in dining room, dormitory, lounge, chapel, bookstore and campus for attempts to understand and interpret the viewpoints of one to the other.

4. To open opportunity for intensive study in extended time periods.

5. To provide occasion for reflection and evaluation on one's ministry...in company with others engaged in similar services, to re-order practices in light of changed views and values.

All of these "operational objectives" -- and I believe they are excellent plans -- have to do with the way the program is carried out, rather than with changes expected in the participants. Consider the verbs used:

To bring into dialogue

To engage in dialogue
To expose to students
To open opportunity for study
To provide occasion for reflection

These verbs permit the program to be judged "good" if it is well carried out, regardless of whether the ministers emerge from it any different from when they began. Administrative goals assume that the educational process has a desirable effect and that all the educator has to do is to set it in motion. Evaluation on these grounds tells you only whether the program was well done; it does not tell you what were the effects on participants or on the social system of which the program and the ministers are a part.

Sponsor Benefits: Another basis for concluding that a program is a good one is to consider the benefits it brings to the sponsoring organization. Seminaries and other institutions have many needs which can be met in part by continuing education programs. Among the case studies we have heard this week are three which show clear Sponsor Benefits:

> The Internship in Urban Ministry has brought to Cleveland College a sizeable government grant, a couple of qualified faculty members, a further reputation as pioneer in professional level adult education and a valuable set of contacts in Cleveland.
>
> The Tower Room Scholars program has for ten years provided a steady stream of public relations agents for Union Seminary, as ministers return to their parishes enthused about their work and their seminary. This has been a valuable asset, whether in raising capital funds or in surviving segregationist attacks.
>
> In-Service Doctoral and Masters Programs have not only helped San Francisco Seminary establish a national constituency (which it needed) and a pioneering reputation, but also have given it formal ties to academic and ecclesiastical leaders in key positions and have in addition produced a surplus of funds.

Each of these can be considered "a good program" quite apart from whether any of the participants is changed in any way, if one takes as his evaluation basis the Sponsor Benefits achieved.

I do not regard Sponsor Benefits cynically, although I do feel there are more significant criteria to be used in evaluation. A continuing education program may or may not list Sponsor Benefits or Administrative Goals among its objectives, but you may be sure that the program will be evaluated by someone from both standpoints. On the whole, Sponsor Benefits are among the most important from the program director's standpoint and ought to be built into an evaluation design whenever possible, especially if the program is a financial drain on the sponsor!

Change Goals: The most important grounds for deciding how good a program one has are the changes which come about in the participants and their backhome settings because of the program. Education seeks to produce changes which are discernible and which have real consequences in the learner's life. To specify the changes you wish to produce in clergymen through continuing education is important but risky. Administrative Goals are relatively safe -- all you have to do is to carry out the program well and it is a success. A program director who doesn't know what kinds of change he wants to induce can always play it safe by listing objectives which are Administrative Goals. Sponsor Benefits are a bit riskier, but on the whole, they tend to be implicit rather than plainly stated, and they usually are less immediately related to the program activity. Sponsors only know they are truly benefitted when you've been at it awhile.

Change goals, however, expose the program for what it is: A process expected to modify the lives of participants. Evaluation of program impact means primarily discovering the degree to which the change goals have been achieved and what unanticipated changes may have occurred as a result of the program. Several continuing educators have attempted, with varying degrees of success, to specify the changes they want to bring about as a result of the educational process. The case study of Internships in Urban Ministry presents one very significant attempt.

Six training goals have been formulated.

1. To sensitize clergymen in depth to problems of the metropolis.
2. To develop in clergy a discipline of analyzing urban problems.
3. To teach clergymen how to strategize with regard to urban problems.
4. To teach clergy more about identifying and utilizing the resources of metropolis to help meet human needs.
5. To enable clergymen to become more effective workers with their constituencies for environmental change.
6. To help clergy clarify their professional roles, and the roles of their religious institutions, in effecting urban change.

Each of these training goals is elaborated in a paragraph, and the program development and evaluation research are specifically done in relation to these desired changes.

It takes a great deal of work to transform these objectives, or other change goals like them, into measurable criteria. This process is the linking of objectives and evaluation and will be our principal concern in the third section of this paper.

Conflict Among the Objectives: Before moving to the relation between objectives and evaluation, however, the rather obvious point should be made that Administrative Goals, Sponsor Benefits and Change Goals may all be characteristic of the same continuing education program, and that at times they may conflict. A diocesan official discovers to his dismay that continuing education participants tend much more frequently than nonparticipants to leave the pastorate for other kinds of work. Or, a director of continuing education, whose program has served the denominational seminary's public image admirably, desires to change the objectives and format of the program, making it interdenominational and interseminary. In such cases, particularly when the sponsor benefits of the continuing education program have not been made explicit, intense strains can develop. Goal subversion can result, wherein well-stated change goals are not fulfilled because the imperatives of the larger organization either undermine or make impossible the needed program.

Such a conflict is often masked by the use of very vague, unspecifiable objectives. Charles V. Willie (1966) reports a training program whose goals included: "to contribute toward the solution of the urgent needs of our time."

When you can't agree on a clear statement of objectives, you end up with just such meaningless words. It would be enlightening to know how many programs of continuing education fail to specify their objectives clearly because to do so would expose hidden conflicts which make agreement impossible.

A Digression on Being Empirically Committed

People who are serious about program evaluation must commit themselves to measurable criteria. This is a fact which produces yawns in some quarters and great arguments in others. But as long as one speaks of change goals and achieving objectives, the possibility of evaluating them depends on the use of empirically measurable indicators of change.

This is no small matter, for methods have their presuppositions. Empirical measures of religious phenomena presuppose that something religiously important is susceptible of measurement. Theological viewpoints which reject measurable outcomes as significant for ministry, which define the objectives of ministry only in terms of "Presence," or "Proclamation" or "Bodying forth the Word", find it extremely difficult to take program evaluation seriously. Karl Barth's inverted agnosticism about the knowledge of God has many such latter day offshoots. They tend to argue that "openness to the Spirit" precludes either predicting or measuring the results of ministry. In my own biased way, I regard this as either intellectual laziness or a failure of nerve.

Incidentally, empirical commitment does not imply believing that everything important is measurable. Nor does it imply that measurement must be in terms of hard quantitative scales. Sometimes a simple "more" or "less" with respect to an anchor point is sufficient. In the Drew Continuing Theological Education Program, a homiletics professor devised a set of five categories within which he rated sermons done at the beginning and at the end of the four week seminar. Using the first sermon as anchor point, he judged Improvement or No improvement for each man, and obtained a crude measure of total change for the whole group.

The point of this digression on empirical commitment is simply to emphasize that defining objectives is not enough. Serious evaluation requires commitment to measurable criteria of program success. This readiness must be rooted in a theology which highly values man's efforts to explore and to order his own world.

Specifying Change Goals

The most common difficulty in relating objectives and evaluation is failing to make objectives specific enough so that measurable criteria of change can be developed. In the remainder of this paper, change goals and their specification will be the focus.

To specify change goals, you must first decide what needs changing -- an obvious point, perhaps, but easily overlooked. What is it in the minister or his situation that needs to be changed through education? Consider the following objective of an institute for ministers:

> To bring to key diocesan clergy a more accurate world view and new insight into cultural and theological change.

These continuing educators have decided to change the way leading (key) clergy view the world and the changes going on in it. They are thus in the attitude change business. Others seek to change the minister's preaching or counseling performance, while still others concentrate on modifying the Church's organizational life through influencing the minister.

There are in fact at least three levels of change goals which require somewhat different approaches, both in programming and in evaluation.

1. Change in personal characteristics of the minister: e.g., changed attitudes, greater self-acceptance, growth in insight or knowledge, etc.

2. Change in ministerial role performance: better preaching, counseling, and other skills; improved relations with laymen, more effective use of community resources, etc.

3. Change in the social systems of which the minister is part: e.g., better leader development in the Church, closer bonds among clergy in the presbytery, better mental health in the community.

How you identify the change goals for your program will depend on how you diagnose the clergyman's situation and what is needed to change it. Correspondingly, evaluation criteria and measurement procedures will vary widely for programs aiming at different levels of change.

It is my impression that many continuing educators do not really define the changes they wish to induce. Rather, they initiate an "educational experience" which they assume will change the learner and somehow renew or strengthen his ministry. The content of this "educational experience" may be drawn from traditional theological education, from continuing education in other settings or from the educator's personal hunches and biases. The program may be powered by intense personal need (as in the case of some therapeutically oriented programs), by the clergy's obvious role inadequacies (as in the case of urban training institutes) or by traditional or bandwagon effects (as is true, I suspect, of summer institutes in some seminaries). But in spite of all the urgency, the programming and the enthusiastic participation of clergy, desired changes are too rarely described and even more rarely evaluated.

The first point, then, in linking goals with evaluation criteria is to decide what is to be changed, and whether it involves the minister's own characteristics, his role performance or his institutional context.

To move beyond this general discussion, let's look at a hypothetical program of continuing education. We will say it is an interdenominational effort in a metropolitan area. Its intended audience is the parish clergy of the sponsoring denominations in the metropolitan area, and the program director deliberately cultivates clergymen from the same or adjacent communities in and around the city.

A preparatory committee has worked hard to produce a planning paper setting forth the needs of the church in the area and pinpointing realistic objectives for the program which will help meet those needs. The primary needs are for clergy leadership to be more alert to the processes of change in the area and more knowledgeable about those processes; and for laymen to be more willing and more able to take leadership in mission to the changing city. Accordingly, the following four change goals are established for this two-week, residential continuing education program:

A. To sensitize clergymen to the significance of secularization and rapid social change;

B. To increase the amount of systematic study done in this field by the clergyman after he returns home;

C. To increase the clergyman's skills and resources in equipping his laymen for mission;

D. To increase the number of action-oriented laymen in e ach clergymen's parish.

Once a program has stated objectives with this much clarity, many planning problems have already been solved. But before we talk about evaluation -- or even about specific planning details -- six "focusing questions" need to be asked and answered about each of the change goals:

1. What does the statement mean concretely? What does the goal look or feel like?
2. How much of the desired change is necessary to justify the program? How will we recognize "success"?
3. What are our best hunches about how to accomplish the goal?
4. Are there intermediate steps, or subgoals along the way?
5. What is likely to get in the way of accomplishing the goal?
6. How can participants be actively enlisted in the attempt to produce the desired change?

Any of these questions, applied to one of the four objectives, could stimulate an entire paper in itself. If the treatment here seems sketchy or arbitrary, it is because brevity is the aim. Let's take goal A, which seeks to change the personal characteristics of participants: "To sensitize clergymen to the significance of secularization and rapid social change." By answering the six focusing questions, we'll be in a good position to prepare an evaluation design.

1. What does it mean concretely? What does the change look or feel like? The key word, of course, is "sensitize". A person sensitive to a topic notices it quickly in even a complex situation. He knows enough about it to understand and use the distinctions and nuances within the topic. He recognizes it as problematic, not simply as part of the background. Thus a clergyman sensitized to the significance of secularization would be able to spot its evidences in a social situation and tell something about its dynamics. He would use it to account, in part, for the way things are.

2. How much sensitization is necessary to consider the program successful? Here we are in trouble because the objective implies that there are just two states: sensitized and unsensitized. Actually, sensitivity is not just "on" or "off", like a light switch, but is "more" or "less", like a thermometer. A change goal should usually be stated in more-or-less terms, allowing you to evaluate movement in a direction rather than achievement of an ideal state.

How would you decide how much sensitization is needed to justify the program? Partly it's a matter of what is realistic to expect in a two week program. Partly also, it depends on how he is to use it. In this case, the desired sensitivity is to be used by the minister "in equipping his laymen for mission." (Goal C) So we decide that if the participant is more sensitized to secularizing forces and rapid social change within the geographical area of his congregation's mission, the program has done its job successfully.

3. What are our best hunches about how to achieve this? I feel very strongly that the best sources of program strategies are the intuitive guesses, the hunches, of experienced workers in the field. Nearly every good curriculum begins this way, illustrating the maxim that science follows art. The evaluator looks critically at the intuitive strategy to discern its dynamics, to figure out why it works. He then builds his indicators in part on the rationale he perceives behind the hunch.

For example, how do you sensitize people to spot and understand and communicate the significance of processes like secularization and rapid social change? What are your hunches?

My own hunch is that a process is best understood by the condensing of time, like the slow motion photography of an opening flower. Films are an excellent vehicle, for revealing processes in this way, but so also is stimulated recall, the evoking of a chain of experiences across the last twenty or thirty years. To understand secularization processes review the wedge driven between sex ethics and theological doctrine: once inseparably linked to theology, ethical statements about sexual behavior now rarely contain any theological content at all. Or look at the growing federal aid to church-related schools: secularization processes have so segmented religious institutions that their educational branches are seen increasingly to be performing public functions. The churches no longer threaten religious freedom, and because the wedge of secularism has been thus driven, federal aid programs are now possible which twenty years ago were unthinkable.

My point is simply that a hunch about how a desired change occurs can lead to greater clarity about the dynamics of the educational process. This in turn gives the evaluator a running start on his measurement problems.

4. Are there intermediate steps, or subgoals along the way? Put differently, are there any conditions we must first achieve in the participants to enable them to become sensitized? Some conditions must exist, of course: each minister must be present, be relatively free from distraction, must focus his attention and must respond (at least inwardly) to the material presented. Beyond these, however, the topic must appear to the clergyman in an analytic rather than a normative mode. He must regard social change, for example, not simply as good or bad but as real, a process to be understood on its own terms rather than moralized about. Until he reaches this condition, sensitization will not occur. This question about intermediate steps is simply the obverse of the next focusing question:

5. What is likely to get in the way of accomplishing the desired change? Part of the evaluator's usefulness to the program planner is in anticipating barriers to goal achievement. What effectively inhibits sensitization among clergymen? Another way to put the question is: what might effectively screen his perceptions, so that he would not see secularization and rapid social change as significant or problematic? Right away some ideas emerge: lack of contact with the evidence of secularization; misinterpretation of the evidence

he does see; an overly narrow job definition; a "Christ against Culture" definition of the gospel.

Specifying the goal thus involves specifying obstacles to achieving the goal. In the process, both planner and evaluator learn more of what a successful program will look like. In particular, the evaluator sees possible unintended consequences which he should be prepared to observe and measure. Many continuing educators of clergymen have found powerful side-effects of their programs, such as relief at having time away from the parish, or enthusiasm at being with fellow ministers in a meaningful way. Some of the most exciting developments in the field come as serendipity, and one way of anticipating their appearance is to ask focusing questions four and five, about intermediate steps and possible barriers.

6. How can participants be actively enlisted in the attempt to produce the desired change? This question seems strangely out of place in such a list, and in a way it is, since it is itself more a goal than a specifying question. As Henry Adams reminds us, the chief objective of the continuing educator is to enable the learner to continue and to direct his own growth personally and professionally. Self-directed change thus is a major goal, and one task of every educator is to ask how to engage the learner in this process.

From the program director's standpoint, therefore, participants who have been drawn into the change-goal plans are more likely to be receptive to the desired changes, more likely to work at changing themselves, and more likely to cooperate in the measurement of change for evaluative purposes. It also becomes easier to build evaluative procedures into the program from the beginning, for the testing of change is legitimized in the participant's eyes.

From a methodological perspective, the enlisting of participants in producing their own change tends to produce a halo effect in which the desired changes appear as greater than they really are because the participants want to appear successful in the outcome. I do not regard this as a serious problem, although methodological purists get excited about it. The point is that it makes the evaluator's job more delicate, since he has to find ways to sort out real from imagined change. A minister can regurgitate a new vocabulary without understanding the process of secularization at all, and the evaluator will have to work hard to tell the difference. The crucial factor is thus the precision with which the desired changes are defined and their dynamics understood -- i.e., how well the focusing questions are answered.

Summary: In our hypothetical continuing education program, being "sensitized to the significance of secularization and rapid social change" has been specified to mean that a clergyman should be able to discern and describe the evidences of secularization in the geographical area of his church's mission and should know enough of how the process works to use it in working with lay leadership. A "condensation of time" method will be used, permitting before-after measurements to be made, and specific efforts will attempt to overcome moralistic and other mindsets as well as to broaden narrow definitions of ministry or gospel. With this beginning, evaluation of change is possible.

Since this paper is already too long, let me simply make a few comments about the focusing questions as they might be used with Goals B, C and D. Questions 1 and 2 (what the goal means and how much change is essential) are, of course, the heart of the specification process. If you want "to increase the clergyman's skills and resources in equipping his laymen for mission" (Goal

C), some hard decisions must be made about what an equipped layman looks like and what skills and resources are needed. Then just which skills are most important and how much change is needed must also be decided. An evaluator can help in thinking through these questions, but he cannot develop an evaluation plan until the decisions are made. Even so simple an objective as B (increasing the amount of systematic study done in this field back home) raises questions: by "amount" does one mean time spent, amount of material covered, or something more subtle like type or quality of material covered? In order to relate objectives and evaluation, these specification questions just have to be answered.

I have already commented on the value of hunches in the specification process (focusing question 3). With some objectives (such as Goal D, I suspect), there may be nothing else to go on but hunches. In any case, people from related fields may prove extremely useful in generating "educated guesses" about how to achieve change goals. It might be a good investment to invite a fund-raiser, a CORE staff member, a League of Women Voters officer and a union organizer to lunch and turn them loose on Goal D: How do you increase the number of action-oriented laymen? And what indicators are useful to define an "action-oriented layman"? Be sure to include your evaluator in the group!

Focusing questions 4 and 5 go together -- perhaps they should not even be numbered separately. They are extremely valuable for considering behavior change goals like B: To increase the amount of serious study done back home. One of the frustrating facts of educational life is that, although an individual's attitudes and behaviors tend to be congruent, changes in his attitudes often do not seem to produce changes in his behavior. (In fact, it seems the reverse is more likely: That behavior changes induce attitude changes.) If you want a man to study more back home, it isn't enough to increase his guilt feelings over it or to give him an interesting two weeks in a library. What are the facilitating conditions and what are the barriers involved? I'm sure there are many, but one strikes me as obvious the moment the focusing question is asked: If he has trouble carving out more time for study, then make him able to cover more in the same time. Has anyone tried speed-reading courses as part of continuing education aimed at increasing the amount of the minister's study? If so, I don't know about it.

Again, what are the barriers to gaining skills in equipping laymen (Goal C)? One may be the lack of a nonthreatening practice situation. All those laymen around in churches near continuing education program sites constitute a resource for relatively nonthreatening practice situations, easily supervised by program faculty.

Once you focus down on change goals, fresh possibilities emerge. The evaluator cannot do his work until objectives are specified in these ways, but of equal importance is the gain in the program planner's own grasp of his job.

What I'm saying to you is: Do not use the focusing questions only because they are good for evaluators; use the focusing questions in your own interest, because they make for better education and stronger programming. Use your evaluator in the same way, from the very beginning of the planning through the long range followup. Use him as a consultant to force you to think beyond your familiar patterns and to specify what you want to accomplish. If he knows that's what you want, he can be of enormous help.

Some Things I Could Have Talked More About

I have purposely stayed away from several topics. One is the problems of measurement. For one thing, my topic was "*Relating* Objectives and Evaluation", and I have stressed primarily that the key to relating them is the specification of Change Goals. Moreover, measurement problems differ from situation to situation, which means that little more than vague nothings can be said apart from local needs. They also are rather technical, which makes them difficult to handle, with a nontechnical group.

A second untouched point is that of control and comparison groups. No more vexing hurdle exists for rigorous evaluation research than how to control for extraneous and contaminating influences. In fact, the use of controls is one of the primary differences between evaluation *research* and informal evaluation procedures. Anyone can do the latter, but the former takes an experienced researcher. Only the former offers reliable evidence that changes observed can be attributed to the program itself.

A third is the significance of followup studies to determine the persistence of effects. Here again the focusing questions about intermediate steps and possible barriers need to be asked. What makes it possible for learning to persist over time, and what gets in the way? It is not enough just to hope that, six months or a year after the program ends, the participant will retain some of the desired change. Planning can provide ways of maximizing that retention, ways which also allow access to measurement opportunities. The use of post-program contacts by telephone or meeting, two-stage conferences (as at the Urban Training Center), or repeat sessions in subsequent years (as in the Young Pastors Schools), represent designs which make it possible to determine persistence of effects. Once again, an evaluator should be in on the earliest program planning, to gain full benefit from the evaluative investment.

Finally, I have not tried to review previous attempts at evaluation of continuing education for clergymen. There have been a few, but they have largely been learning experiences for evaluators and have not given much help to program people. Even the one which the Ministry Studies Board is now finishing up, studying the Tower Room Scholars, the Church World Institute, and the Drew University program, falls far short of full usefulness. *The central problem with every single attempt thus far has been the lack of goal specification.* Because of this fact, which has been the fault both of program planners and of evaluators, but principally the former -- objectives and evaluation were never really linked, and so the accumulation of research data really didn't say much about the success of the program.

Summary and a Parting Plea

If a program is to be empirically evaluated, it must be planned by objectives, and there are some clear rules for this.

1. You must be careful to distinguish between types of objectives -- change goals, administrative goals and sponsor benefits.

2. You must first decide what needs changing -- what are the foci of the clergyman's problem -- personal characteristics, role performance, or his social system.

3. A prior commitment to measurable criteria of program success is essential.

4. Goal specification is the key process in relating objectives and evaluation -- it's hard work, but rewarding and necessary.

5. Goal specification is an orderly process, and I have offered you a set of "focusing questions" for the task.

For the program planner and administrator, an evaluation researcher is a tremendous asset. He acts as consultant in the earliest planning stages, bringing fresh categories to cut across and illuminate familiar facts, and offering new facts to modify old categories. The evaluator takes the hunches and intuitive judgments which are the daily work of the administrator and looks for systematic factors behind them, the dynamics which produce the observable effects. He anticipates barriers to change and spots intermediate steps. Not only the desired changes but also unintended consequences are his concern. He is a reality-tester par excellence and a major source of innovative suggestions.

In short, the evaluator, when used rightly, is a valuable member of a continuing education team. The wisdom of Charles V. Willie (1966) on this point is beyond argument:

> "Staff, of course, is expensive. While some organization may find it necessary to launch into the evaluation process in earnest with the part-time assistance of a consultant, plans should be underway for eventually placing the research-evaluation staff on a full-time basis, and placing such a staff at a policy-making level so that research-evaluation concerns may be raised at the time new program concerns are considered. What I am saying, I suppose, is that we tend to think about that which we can do best. And if we are not very handy at operationalizing concepts and goals, constructing questionnaires and schedules and computing correlation coefficients, we tend not to think of these technical dimensions of data collection and analysis until it is too late to do an effective job. But if we have paid a person to think about these things and if this is his job and that which he can do best, he will force these concerns upon an organization as it develops new program thrusts.

A BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "What it's about"

Benjamin S. Bloom, Editor, with Max D. Engelhart, Edward J. Furst, Walker H. Hill, David R. Krathwohl. Taxonomy of Education Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals (New York: David McKay Co.: 1056), Two Vols., paper.

Cyril O. Houle, The Inquiring Mind (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1963).

Charles V. Willie, "Evaluation Resources and Their Use", Information Service (National Council of Churches), XLV: 3 (Feb. 12, 1966), 1-5.

2. "How to do it"

Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching," in N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1962).

Elizabeth Herzog, "Guidelines for Evaluation Research", Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau; 1959 (Good Bibliography).

Fred Massarik, "A Sensitivity Training Impact Model: Some First (& Second) Thoughts on Evaluation of Sensitivity Training" (NTL, 1965); No. 3 in Explorations in Human Relations Training and Research series.

3. "How we did it"

Harry L. Miller and Christine H. McGuire, Evaluating Liberal Adult Education (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961).

Leslie Wilkins, Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action and Research (Prentice Hall, 1965).

Charles R. Wright and Herbert Hyman, "The Evaluators," in Philip E. Hammond, Sociologists at Work (Basic Books, 1964), pp. 121-141.

Two brief studies of NTL Training Labs:
Paul C. Buchanan, "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Laboratory Training in Industry" (NTL Labs, 1507 M. Street, Washington, D.C. 20036), No. 1 in Explorations in Human Relations Training and Research series.
Douglas R. Bunker, "The Effect of Laboratory Education upon Individual Behavior" (NTL, 1963).

Charles V. Willie, "Evaluation Resources and Their Use", _Information Service_ (National Council of Churches), XLV: 3 (Feb. 12, 1966), 1-5.

2. "How to do it"

Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching," in N. L. Gage (Ed.), _Handbook of Research on Teaching_ (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1962).

Elizabeth Herzog, "Guidelines for Evaluation Research", Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau; 1959 (Good Bibliography).

Fred Massarik, "A Sensitivity Training Impact Model: Some First (& Second) Thoughts on Evaluation of Sensitivity Training" (NTL, 1965); No. 3 in _Explorations in Human Relations Training and Research_ series.

3. "How we did it"

Harry L. Miller and Christine H. McGuire, _Evaluating Liberal Adult Education_ (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961).

Leslie Wilkins, _Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action and Research_ (Prentice Hall, 1965).

Charles R. Wright and Herbert Hyman, "The Evaluators," in Philip E. Hammond, _Sociologists at Work_ (Basic Books, 1964), pp. 121-141.

Two brief studies of NTL Training Labs:
Paul C. Buchanan, "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Laboratory Training in Industry" (NTL Labs, 1507 M. Street, Washington, D.C. 20036), No. 1 in _Explorations in Human Relations Training and Research_ series.
Douglas R. Bunker, "The Effect of Laboratory Education upon Individual Behavior" (NTL, 1963).

THE IN-SERVICE MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

San Francisco Theological Seminary
San Anselmo, California

Henry B. Adams

Description of the Program

The program combines resident and in-parish study over a three year period for the Master's Degree and a seven year period for the Doctor's Degree. Resident study takes place during a six weeks' session in alternate years. In-parish study consists of individually designed programs of investigation relevant to the pastor's professional needs and drawing upon input from his parish work. The third in-parish study project of Master's students is a more independent and extended piece of work, serving as a thesis. At the conclusion of five in-parish projects, doctoral candidates complete qualifying examinations and then devote two or more years to a research project in parish ministry which is reported in a dissertation.

The program is designed to make possible a number of things:

1. Serious study in depth without extended absence from professional duties.

2. Exploration of the theory (or theology) of pastoral practice by which each man may bring his work under critical judgment.

3. Long-term opportunity for weaving many small bits of learning into a systematic whole within which a re-education of style of life becomes possible.

4. Fiscal support for the cost of education which draws primarily upon the current expense budgets of local churches and agencies.

The summer residences offer seminars focused upon the theory of pastoral practice. Each summer's curriculum focuses upon the following questions, in the following order: "What is the nature of the Church's ministry?" "How are the people of God equipped for their ministry?" And "What is required of the man (the minister) and his methods for this equipment for ministry?" Three seminars explore the same question which informs that summer's curriculum, drawing upon resource materials from the origins of the Faith, the Historical-theological Development of the Faith, and from the Contemporary Scene.

Students submit their plans for individualized in-parish study to staff counselors and ultimately to a Faculty Committee for approval. They may work under the oversight of any approved specialist, who serves the seminary as an adjunct professor on retainer. Some 150 scholars are available for this supervisory service. Each study project is reported in a minimum of five major papers, one of which displays how the study has affected the way in which he carries on his work. Adjunct professors prepare extended written evaluations of each paper, interacting with the student regarding his on-going growth and investigation.

The program, thus, offers a structure under which over the years pastoral theory may be explored in concert, while individualized self-development is also undertaken. It requires that study and practice be related and interleaved continuously, and it allows the individualized needs of each man, as these emerge over the years, to inform the character of the study.

Formulation of the Original Design

For many years prior to the launching of the program in 1961, Faculty had been exploring various procedures for offering serious, systematic opportunities for study to pastors as means of enhancing their continuing growth. It was originally thought that tuition charged for B.D. and other work would adequately underwrite expenses. It was further assumed that the program would attract only a very small, elite group of pastors, and that parish work was the beneficiary of study rather than a source of input. These elements underwent some change in the first years.

Assumptions Underlying the Original Design

1. The minister needs opportunity to engage in systematic study and investigation of matters relevant to this work.

2. Study which is informed primarily by the minister's pressing professional needs is more likely to result in significant learning and provide satisfaction that will sustain him in long-term effort.

3. Combining and alternating communal study in residence with individualized inquiry at home offers an important means of developing theoretical breadth and specialized depth.

4. Involving officers and members of the church served by the student as participants in the program offers many important benefits.

5. Intensive, full-time resident study is the most effective way to learn, but since pastors rarely have this kind of opportunity, extensive in-parish study is a necessity. (This assumption has since been abandoned on the basis of experience. Resident and in-parish study serve different purposes, and for some purposes in-parish study is significantly more effective).

6. Some socially significant form of recognition for achievement is necessary to sustain men for long-term investment of time, energy, and money.

Changes Made in the Design

1. The response of pastors has been so overwhelming that admissions originally set at 14-18 per year have been increased to 40 per year. A total of 170 will be enrolled this summer. To make possible enrollments that will be more than all other enrollments of

the institution put together, tuition has radically increased. In 1966-67, tuition covers every identifiable expense plus 10%.

2. Whereas study was conceived as primarily enriching pastoral performance, there is now a concerted effort to have men draw input to their study from the realities in which they work, developing their studies on the action-research model in which the professional context both provides input and receives output from the process.

3. Involving officers and church members as participants was originally conceived as a means of supplying financial resources and moral support for the pastor in his studies. An increasing number of pastors are drawing laymen into the inquiry with them, making them contributors to the process, and forming a community of learning shared widely. The action-research model lends itself to this admirably, and counseling of students increasingly encourages such efforts in the parish.

Objectives of the Present Program Design and Needs They Seek to Meet

1. To enable ministers to evolve a theory of their professional life and work by which they can bring their activities under judgment, and which they can articulate, defend and trace to empirical and normative grounds.

2. To enable ministers to design and execute programs of learning relevant to their parish duties, with declining need for supervision.

3. To enable ministers to form habits of continual study and investigation, which is systematically integrated into their calendar of work and which contribute to the performance of their duties.

4. To enable ministers to learn-how-to-learn the practice of ministry from the practice of it.

The program expects to make a contribution to competence for pastoral work, although it acknowledges the virtual impossibility of defining pastoral competence. It is assumed that more often than not, a minister who achieves the objectives above will prove more competent for the work in which he is engaged than one who does not achieve them.

Evaluation of the Program

Evaluation is perhaps the weakest part of the program. Each seminar or in-parish project has the standard academic evaluation by grades. Inevitably these tend to measure mastery of substance more often than the use of substance in performance. And this evaluation is remote from the objectives set for the program.

Beyond this, each student is asked annually to complete an evaluation of the program as he perceives it. These are systematically analyzed, excerpted and classified. The results are supplied to each person or office for whom they have relevance. Professors, similarly are asked to supply evaluations of the program from their perspectives, which are fed into planning by staff and Faculty Committee.

The chief evaluation instruments for student achievement of objectives are qualifying examinations and dissertation for doctoral candidates and thesis for Master's candidates. These quite consciously focus upon assessing the student's grasp of pastoral theory and his ability to think theologically about pastoral work. But they offer little evaluation of achievement of the other objectives.

Objectives set for the program reflect efforts to express sound theory of adult education in the program. Evaluation processes reflect still an academic preoccupation with mastery of substance and theory at the expense of facilitative learnings which enable men to be continual learners.

CHANGING STRATEGIES OF THE CHURCH IN SOCIETY AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Richard Nesmith

At the outset, let us examine the social background which provides the context within which the Church is struggling to define relevant strategies. In these strategizing processes we have to take at least four kinds of revolutions into account:

(1) Expectations
(2) Urbanization
(3) Internationalization
(4) Technology

The revolution of rising expectations is illustrated by the aspirations of the urban Negro or the migrating White from Appalachia. The urban revolution lifts up the transition from relationships which are "face to face" as in rural life to the legal-rational pattern of relationships characteristic of urban life. Obviously other kinds of ingredients such as the massive concentration of population, dominance by corporate structures and mass means of communication are marks of urban society as well. Internationalization refers to the fact that technology has given us "one world" and the capacity to perceive and be addressed by what's happening in every other corner of the globe. And technology itself completes the listing of the revolutions that must be taken into account.

The theological background reaches back across Liberalism with its optimistic view of man, followed by neo-orthodoxy with a more pessimistic view of man. I don't know what term to use for distinguishing where we are now -- neo-liberalism may be appropriate so long as we recall the refinements of the past decade. Dietrich Bonhoeffer represents a very interesting synthesis. His book, The Cost of Discipleship, with its emphasis on the quality of fellowship and worship parallels orthodoxy -- while the emphasis upon involvement, characteristic of his later writing, reflects liberalism.

As a third quick background note, let's examine several assumptions in Church-world relationships as they undergird current strategizing. First, the Church exists for mission. This emphasis sees the Church moving into the world as an incarnating force struggling to enflesh the character of God's love in the relationships that exist throughout the community. The Church exists for the tasks of relating, disclosing and enabling in external relations, the world. Internally, it exists for the purpose of nurturing or equipping the saints, so they can articulate and enflesh the love of God in the life of the culture.

A second assumption is that the Church is called to oneness, despite the extent of our division. This is increasingly evident around the strategy tables where churchmen from an unusually wide range of denominations are beginning to work together, affirming the necessity for unity coupled with diversity.

Third, both the individual and the corporate levels of society are the legitimate and necessary concern of the mission of the Church. The corporate character of society, its systems and its system arrangements, factors which significantly mold the life style of individuals, are themselves the subject of mission, the prophetic concern of mission, the healing concern of mission.

Now against this background let's move directly into comments on the function of the Church. One key, initial word around the strategy table is "perception." An initial function of the Church in its mission is to perceive the nature of the world. But the Pastor and his people should become sensitive to the nature of the community so that instead of being among the last, they should be in the vanguard perceiving needs and changes.

A second concept is "ideation." By ideation I am suggesting that it is a part of the mission responsibility of the Church to conceptualize models of action or ideas that will give meaning and direction to life within the culture. Let me give an illustration. We currently talk about model cities because of legislation bearing the same name. But what is the character of a model city? There is deep disagreement as to what a model city would really be. And certainly there is extensive disagreement between, for example, a thoughtful planner on the one hand, and a profit-motivated developer on the other. One of the great services responsible Christian thinkers could provide at this time would be to outline ideas on the nature of that city that would be the most human and the most pregnant with possibilities for the fulfillment of man in community.

A third concept is the task of being both the conserver and the realizer of cultural values. This includes both individual and corporate factors. The Church must help to appraise and conserve present values, or realize potential values, both of which will enable the fulfillment of persons and community.

Fourth, meeting individual needs. This was a primary function in the role of the Church in past decades. The emphasis today calls for the public sector of our society to provide these kinds of services. In this instance it is the role of the Church to help keep these services "honest" and sensitively administered. And where there are needs that cannot be met by the public sector it is the Church's mission to fulfill a direct service.

These functions have been essentially outward-oriented. There are two internally rooted functions which must also be noted: nurture and reformation.

The nurture function includes preparation in worship, educational experiences, reflection and action within the life of the community. And, finally, the internal task of the Church includes reforming itself.

This leads quite naturally to reflection on the forms that seem to be emerging as the vehicles by which to articulate a strategy aimed at such functions. Most of you will recognize an increasing emphasis upon multi-form congregations. We are probably not going to deal with most young adults in the context of residence congregations, for example. Their needs call for a specialized form which may center in an apartment fellowship. Likewise, certain kinds of vocational groupings or special communities are going to call for special ministries and groupings that address needs at that level.

Again, however, if we are talking about life in a radically corporate culture, one of the most significant strategy directions the Church must assume is that of developing more broadly scaled corporate forms. Many denominations are moving in that direction. If one looks at the United Presbyterian Church he sees the Presbytery playing an increasing role as the threshold for address to the community on the part of the Church as a corporate body. In the Methodist denomination there is a strong effort underway to create metropolitan commissions and rural, regional units that can facilitate this same kind of context in which laity and clergy alike can perceive, can go through ideational processes and can address the corporate structures in which they work and live.

A further expression of a corporate structure is community organization itself, and I list this separately. I am referring here to those processes through which a community organizes itself as a secular entity in order to facilitate the betterment of the community. This may range from a rural development type with relatively little overt conflict to a ghetto organization with deliberate conflict stances built into it because of the intransigence of the power structures that impose themselves on the ghetto. Some other kinds of functions also need to be fulfilled: a research function, a planning function, a think function, and a training function.

Now, let's comment quickly on implications. The kinds of strategies and social circumstances we have been talking about require certain resources from our leadership and from our educational and training processes. Basic, of course, is the continuing need for increased knowledge. In a period of high social change it is all the more crucial that the educational processes communicate a knowledge of our bearings. When, for example, a young pastor initiates a special group for young adults meeting in an apartment, having communion on the floor, he needs to be guided by a balance of current needs and historical perspectives. If he is going to change his course, let him at least change it knowledgeably in the light of what the Church has been. I hardly need to add that the knowledge input should include a full range of information from other spheres such as the social sciences. This underlines the importance of being able to work in group processes and to understand ourselves in those processes so that we can move into a group and facilitate its life. The development of interpersonal and group skills should also incorporate concerns for developing the capacity for involvement in conflict. This is particularly necessary if we deal with the corporate structures of our time.

As one who has just left the ranks of seminary teaching, I have to say that I don't know of anything in almost any seminary I have ever seen that really grapples with the issue of helping a man to work in the midst of conflict. This becomes one of the puzzling mandates that I think exists for us. It is not enough for us to talk about grappling with a power structure that is imposing itself upon the ghetto, or about a town and country situation that's tied up by three families. We must also assist men at the point of the conflicts emerging out of the internal reformational tasks. We must help these men learn how to work in and with conflict. Further, however, if we were to deal with the internal, reformational task that I identified as a mission function, the same holds true. We must have the willingness and courage, it seems to me, to assist men and women in becoming agents for the conservation and realization of value in the conflicts within the life of the Church itself.

Planning represents an additional essential. In this period of change, not only do we need to know our bearings, but we need the capacity to define objectives, resources, alternative designs, obstacles and developmental skills. This is simply an outline of the planning process which ought to be part of the educational experience, if we are to learn how to move through the processes of change.

We must emphasize creativity. Yesterday's answers will give some guidance for today, but they will often not give an adequate answer. The best answer to a situation may only emerge off the threshold of a new design or idea. Greater creativity can be achieved through training. We need to tear up many of the designs that have been used for centuries in our educational processes in order to attempt new ways of combining certain classical threads with more creative uses of settings that exist within the life of a community. This should attempt to encourage the development of new capacities for perception and creativity.

This points to a final note: The need for an enabling framework. One of the realities we face is that there are a number of continuing education and training programs around the country which are inadequately used. In many instances this is because no linkage exists between men and women with their needs, on the one hand, and the training resources on the other. Our denominational systems have not developed support systems for encouraging aspiration, recruitment processes and guidance.

This suggests that in addition to talking about creative new resources, more significant and thoughtful use of the already established resources must be emphasized. We may need to facilitate this in most regions by the development of an enabling framework capable of acting as a broker or midwife between pastor or laymen with training needs on the one side and our varied resources on the other.

RELATING OBJECTIVES AND EDUCATIONAL PROCEDURES: TOWARD AN OPERATIONAL THEORY OF MOTIVATION

Thomas W. Klink

There is a small but significant shift in the title of these remarks from the title listed in your schedules. The topic assigned by the program planners was "relating objectives and motivation." That is a good title but, in its brevity, it omits a critical middle term and fails to identify the working significance of motivational concerns. It may serve as proper preface to these remarks to indicate that I propose to talk to the theme: "Relating Objectives and Educational Procedures: Towards an Operational Theory of Motivation."

Although my contribution to this seminar is, of course, my own, I would not be fair unless I indicated that the experiences and theories are joint products with associates and colleagues in the clinical pastoral training movement, in the division of religion and psychiatry, The Menninger Foundation, and in a variety of continuing educational efforts ranging from extended residential training, through the traditional "quarters" of clinical pastoral training, to short-term workshops and seminars and on to the "one-shot," often one-day "conferences." Some of these experiences have included learners who have been involved in the group ministry of an institutional chaplaincy; some have assembled learners who are individually and separately responsible for pastoral work but who participate as learners in a concurrent and sustained educational and supervisory process. Other experiences involve previously interconnected working communities who have sought an educational "intervention" into their on-going social system, and for whom the paradigm of the family has appeared to be directly relevant. Still others have involved groups of learners who may be categorically described as belonging to a certain class, for example, the pastors from a certain community or from a certain denominational body or the nominees for supervisory function in a field education project. On a few occasions we have had experiences with groups of learners who are also embedded in a well-organized system of evaluation and recognition apart from our educational process, for example, nursing home operators who must successfully complete the in-service education program to maintain their license or clergymen who are seeking to qualify for certification as marriage or pastoral counselors or as supervisors of clinical pastoral education.

I mention this variety of programs and this variety of bases for organization of a learning group because it has been presumed in our continuing educational work that such varieties make an important difference in the ways wherein educational procedures are designed. But, more importantly, we have presumed that, despite the varieties of programs and organizational designs, a generally applicable theory, relevant to all, can be stated. The central foundation for this general theory is an operational theory about motivation.

It is important to make explicit at the outset of the discussion of motivation that our work has taken a frankly psychodynamic rather than a behavioristic perspective.[1] Thus, we have been concerned with identifying the nature and extent of the disparity between self-concept and desired self-image, estimating the ability of the learner to sustain a working awareness of the discrepancy, pinpointing the thematic and potentially working foci of the discontent. *We have, in briefest summary, regarded motivation as a particular form of organization of anxiety; anxiety about the self and about the future, organized in such a way as to lead towards action.* Although our theory is intimately continuous with theories employed in psychotherapy, especially psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy, we maintain that there is a distinct difference between processes of education and processes of psychological treatment, however common the theories of motivation may be. Still more specifically, we have rejected as having only limited usefulness those theories of motivation for learning which derive from the concept of conditioning and which are applied through the methods of suppression (or extinction) and reinforcement.

The practical application of our perspective on motivation identifies two points in any process of learning where motivational factors are operationally important. In a working paper for the Chicago Conference on Continuing Education[2] I designated these two points by speaking of "motivation *for* (entering into) continuing education" and "motivation *in* (the processes of) continuing education."

Motivation "for" education involves the creation of some structure of expectation which effectively merges the objectives of the educator with the needs of the learner. The product which results at this point is a mutual "contract" for the work of learning. Initiative and responsibility for the process is distributed appropriately and explicitly to both the teacher and the learner. Assent to the interdependent role definitions is sought actively. Functionally, the contract-making elicits, clarifies and organizes the broad outlines of procedure whereby the anxiety of the learner (and the anxious responsibility of the educator) will be put to work in a mutual task (or series of tasks). We have applied this concept, most elaborately, in the advertising, application, interviewing and appointing process leading to a year-long program of residential training in pastoral care and counseling. (In that process, we have drawn heavily upon the years of experience in the clinical pastoral training movement.) But we have also applied this concept about motivation for learning in our interpretation of the presence of registrants in the briefest one-day, "one-shot" event. For educational efforts which lie between those two extremes we have used variations in procedure which reflect the same motivational concept: that is, the initial organization of anxiety into a structure of expectation which defines interdependent working tasks. Whenever circumstances have permitted -- or where the potential investment of time and energy demands -- we have relied on the procedures of careful advertisement, extended written application, individualized reply, individual interviews and, where indicated, a responsive appointment to the program. In briefer programs we have applied our theory through written application (usually plus a significant payment of money) accompanied by a request for a brief but concrete vignette of the individual applicant's experience of success and/or need in relation to the working area for the program. When circumstances or brevity have permitted none of these preparatory procedures we have, at least, begun the program with a specific and properly detailed statement of our understanding of the meaning of the learners' presence in the session. To ignore these steps is, in our experience, to invite cancellations and absences, and that painful experience for the educator of feeling that he is carrying the full burden of the whole class on his shoulders. Occasionally, in this era of careless group Rorschach's and "feely-feely" T-Groups, omission of proper concern for motivational factors invites the degeneration of a continuing educational program into an anti-therapeutic, often-destructive therapy-like chaos of "depth sharing."

---

[1] See, for further exposition of a psychodynamic perspective on learning, T. W. Klink, "Supervision" in Charles Feilding, *Education for Ministry* (Dayton: American Assn. of Theological Schools, 1966), 176-217, esp. 181-5, 191-4, 201-2; Jerome David Frank, *Persuasion and Healing* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1961); Paul Pruyser, "Existential Notes on Professional Education," *Social Work* (1963), 82-87; Charlotte Towle, *The Learner in Education for the Professions, As Seen in Education for Social Work* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1954).

[2] T. W. Klink, "Motivation and Continuing Education," *National Consultation on Continuing Education for the Ministry*, Univ. of Chicago, June 8-12, 1965, pp. 143-146. (Mimeographed)

Motivation "in" the educational process continues the application of an anxiety-rooted theory. The task of the educator is to continue to maintain a working focus for the application of the anxiety of the learner, revising and responding in relation to the shifting sense of need and readiness in the student. He does this with some awareness of the several critical perversions of anxiety from its useful role as a stimulus for action. Thus, he is aware that anxiety is avoided or defended against by all the complex devices known to the human psyche. He is aware, too, that anxiety can be displaced or projected upon the program, the teacher, the other learners and that some device for personal assimilation of the material presented will be necessary: individual supervisory or consultative conferences, or small group sessions are the most common form for restricting the effect of displacement. The effective educator will be aware that anxiety, or, more properly, the expectation of relief from anxiety can be so futurized that stimulus for present activity is neutralized. And, of course, the educator will remain cognizant of the episodic impact of anxiety in a learning process, the "rhythm of education" which Whitehead has described. In such times, often strangely arbitrary as to content, the learners seem to confront a crisis of change, struggling actively and highly personally with the new ideas. I don't think that we in Topeka are unique in evolving a private mythology about the timing of such salient episodes: In the yearlong program we talk of the post-"New Year breakthrough" and the "after-Easter threat to regurgitate it all." Among clinical training supervisors there has always been talk of the "5th or 6th week crisis" and the staff of our week-long seminars for industrial executives identify the "Wednesday night blow-up." We have even come to talk about the "2:00 o'clock jump" in one-day affairs. I presume that each of you can de-mythologize such local myths, re-mythologizing them into relevancies for your experiences. However stated, the expressions point to critical vicissitudes of motivation during an educational process. In another place I have tried to explicate a starting point for a theory of their significance for education.[3]

In the remainder of my time, I should like to illustrate the theory of motivation as applied to a concrete continuing education program. The material that follows is a series of excerpts from an initial presentation to a two-day conference of Christian educators from a Protestant denomination gathered for an annual program of professional training. Conversations with designated officers of this group focused a thematic and working concern on the "mutual expectations" involved in Christian Education. On this basis every registrant was invited, by individually addressed letter, to submit two one-page vignettes, one describing a success in meeting the expectations of "significant others" and an occasion in which there was a failure to meet the expectations of "important others." The workshop, planned as a result of such negotiations, was projected over a two-day period with four lectures and four small group discussions. The initial presentation in that workshop (one of the four lectures) -- offered here as an illustration of the application of motivational theory -- was as follows:

---

[3] T. W. Klink, "Supervision" in Charles Feilding, Education for Ministry. Dayton: American Assn. of Theological Schools, 1966, pp. 191-194.

> I like, whenever reasonably proper, to take my audience into my confidence about what I intend to do and why I think I intend to do it. I would like to begin our day and a half together by doing just that. Let me try and, in doing so, try to outline the process of change or learning or helping scheduled between now and tomorrow noon.
>
> The leaders in this process are members or associates of the Division of Religion and Psychiatry, Departments of Education and Preventive Psychiatry of The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas. The Menninger Foundation is a center, originally, for the treatment of persons with serious psychological distresses. More recently, we have become involved with many other persons, people who are not sick or disturbed, but who are in critically important positions for aiding others to be less conflicted, less unhappy and more able to be equal in their lives to their potentials.
>
> This latter kind of work has meant activity as educators or consultants to school officials, police officers, clergymen, industrial executives, Peace Corps and State Department personnel, nuns and seminary faculties, college leaders, *et al*. In the course of our work we have perfected the outlines of a theory about how we can be of help to such important people. Our theory is rooted in our -- and other's -- earlier work with patients yet it does not presume that anyone in such a meeting as this is a patient; only that an adequate theory about human beings must be broad enough and deep enough to include people at all stages of life, in all conditions and in all situations. So, we come to this meeting of Christian educators with a well-developed theory about how we can be of help to you. Your leaders, in agreeing to our plans, seemed to think that our theory was indeed relevant -- but they might be what William James once called "tender-minded ones." We have to depend on you all -- "tough-minded practitioners from out in the field" -- to discover whether our theory about a helping process is useful. We believe that the theory is relevant to this occasion *and* to the task with which you are occupied. So, on to the theory.
>
> We are led to believe, first of all, that any helping process must be initiated by *discontent* in the individual who is to be helped. Colloquially, we say that the person or organization must be "hurting" before anything can change or be helped. We know this is true of patients and we are sure that Jesus knew it, too, because

when he confronted the paralytic at the pool of Bethsaida he started with making sure of his discontent -- "Wilt thou be made whole?"[4] If I would not be misunderstood I'd use a clinical word, "anxiety", and say that we are convinced that any helping/changing/learning process has to begin with the mobilization of anxiety, which is the familiar unpleasant, inner sense of disquiet about the way things are.

However, we are led by our experience to believe that the helping/changing/learning process can be hindered -- even stalled completely -- if discontent and anxiety are too powerful. It is necessary to titrate the dosage of this potent medicine of challenge lest the person or organization mobilize itself against the discontent as though it was a threat rather than a stimulus. There are many ways in which the pressure of anxiety and discontent can be controlled but, at the beginning of a process, the most important ways are the emotionally responsive acceptance of persons as they are and the attentive noticing of their achievements. (It may illustrate my point to report that in the clinical practice of helping there is a wise cliche which states, "You have to respect the symptoms before you can treat the disease.")

In the light of such a theory we began our participation in this workshop last October when we wrote the Instructions to Participants. Those two requests were our effort to mobilize your discontent about your functioning as a Christian educator. First, we asked you to write a brief precis concerning an incident in which you failed to meet your own or others expectations. We left the matter open-ended because we know that anxiety is often focused (or even transferred) in the relations with significant others, but (more importantly) anxiety is derived from the expectations we have of ourselves. As we understand the helping/changing/learning process, we know that it is important to keep both of these items potentially available. But, we are not doing a psychoanalysis, we are doing a workshop in the important but bounded area of the practice of the vocation of Christian Education. So, we tried to set some limits on this mobilized discontent and we limited the request to "an incident in your experience as a Christian educator." At the same time, on the same sheet, we asked you to describe a success, an incident in which you felt that you had met expectations. We believe that it is particularly useful to support the human dialectic of success and discontent, of achievement and failure, of security and anxiety in order for any helping/changing/learning process to take place.

(By the way, if you are interested in such things, I have already firmly taken sides against a psychology of learning as simply conditioning and reinforcement, a theory initiated by Pavlov's work on the drooling dogs and exemplified in the official psychology of the Soviet Union. Argumentum ad hominem, but accurate!)

The Soviet allusion does, however, stimulate me to a realistic paragraph in this theoretical exposition. The theory so far described is reasonably apt for those of you who responded to the instruction sheet and sent me your statements before February 5. But the fact of the matter is that there are 27 people here as participants and we received only 7 statements by February 5 plus no late statements. Giving or taking the fact that a few who wrote had to cancel plans to be here, and a few who were firmly convinced that they could not come were able to come at the last minute, that leaves 20 of you who seem not to have taken the bait of our theory by the "bite" of your statements of complementary discontent and satisfaction. What shall we do with you? How can we conceive of your involvement in this brief process of change/learning/help? Should we be impatient and designate you as equivalent to the Pauline "lukewarm ones?" Or, should we be polite and ignore your omission, hoping that you will get the message of the leader's standards and "catch up somehow?" Maybe, we should berate you for your sloth/resistance/ busyness? We could openly assume that you did not believe there was any need at all on your part to learn/change/be helped. We could try making a "big scene," identify you by name, issue pencils and papers, alert a Xerox machine operator, dismiss the rest of the group and, remedially but traumatically, give you time to "catch up," "do your part," "put up or get out," etc. The most attractive alternative would be to invite your alibis and explanations -- "a new field that had to be plowed," "a new wife," the flu, planning the Epiphany tree-burning, "death in the family," etc. But what would we gain by any of these methods? Our theory about the changing/learning/helping process says that we would have gained nothing!

---

[4] John 5:6.

In fact, our theory presumes that our handling of this fact may be the most critical matter of the whole process. It becomes critical because it is our first encounter with an inevitable quartet accompanying any helping/learning/changing process. Here we shall have to use words derived from the therapeutic process but shall give them meaning in more general terms. The four terms are:

1. Ambivalence
2. Resistance and ego-autonomy
3. Individual Difference
4. Counter-transference

Let us consider each one briefly:

Ambivalence is a psychological equivalent of Newton's 3rd law -- for every motion there is an opposite reaction. Thus, for every one of us, the desire to learn/change/be helped is matched by a contrary but powerful desire to leave things as they are/to avoid entangling helping alliances/to keep the present view. These contrary forces exist although the balance between them differs in different people, at different times or places, in relation to different matters. The opposition of forces may not even be conscious but it will be revealed in slips of the tongue, in forgetting, in the purposefully revealing accidents and incidents which Freud called parapraxes. Our theory demands that we understand the missing papers -- even after all other accounting has been done -- as parapraxes, evidence of the mixed feelings about this whole process, no more nor less significant than the fact that you are here. And lest those of you who turned in your papers think that this has nothing to do with you, our theory demands that we understand you as persons similarly ambivalent about learning/change/help but with the balance poised somewhat differently. That text which records the cry of ambivalence -- "I believe, help thou my unbelief" -- is a universally relevant phrase not a uniquely agnostic bit of agony. If we are to begin by emotionally responsive acceptance of you as you are, we must find a way to accept your ambivalence about learning/changing/being helped.

Ambivalence is a clinical term which designates a special form of the universal character of human nature, divided and pulled by conflicting forces. We understand your presence here as embedded in the experience of conflicting (organized) (ambivalent) drives. Taken by itself such a situation can provoke a steady state of pessimism about any enterprise for helping/teaching/changing. Our theory, however, notes another element in our encounter which permits limited, operational optimism; this element is designated as ego-autonomy and is best observed in relation to a varying human state called resistance.

Ego-autonomy is illustrated here by the fact that despite the ambivalence evidenced in your response to the instructions you are here and with greater or less freedom, greater or less resistance, you have some measure of independence from the contradictory forces. A sailboat without a hand on the tiller and exposed to the forces of wind on sail and the contradictory pressures of water on hull and keel will "come up into the wind," that is, it will poise like a windvane, sails fluttering, getting nowhere. That position is analogous to the ambivalent forces of personality. But put a hand on the tiller and main sheet, let the yachtsman hike his weight into position, choosing first this tack then coming about on another, resisting the unrestrained pressure of the forces, and the vessel becomes a leaping, living thing because a semi-autonomous force -- a sailor -- has been inserted into an otherwise balanced system. The sailor is analog for the ego in the person to be taught or to be helped. As you know, no sailor can sail directly into the wind -- the limits of resistance must be respected. Nor is it possible for any vessel to move at the full speed of the wind; there will be delay, loss of momentum, tricky moments of coming about from one tack to another; but, for the sailor there is only one question, "Given this boat, and the wind from such and such direction and the destination being over there, and the amount of keel and hull and hiking weight, what are the choices open which will sail me where I want to go?" The answer is nearly always a series of steps -- a course of tacks and runs which by sequential advance moves around or through resistance to the destination without being capsized.

Thus, we note that each of you has in some way or another found freedom to come here and begin participation in this little voyage. Our choices in this day are not unlimited but neither are they defined in advance. We are led to believe that your ego autonomy will be enhanced for any changing/learning/helping process if we can identify ourselves with the feelings you experience in the process, sometimes hearing your excitement about the distant destination, sometimes listening to the anxious confidence concerning a part of the voyage, again, thinking with you about the choices open or even the mistakes made. To reiterate our analogy from sailing, we want to be on the side of the sailor, not the wind or the water.

A third element in the helping/changing/learning process is the *individual differences* which each of you represent. We all know that 2 + 2 = 4, "God is love," and "today is Friday." But none of us knows what such formulae, texts and statements mean to each of us here. They can be learned like some of the gibberish of a Mao-think pamphlet, memory verse phrases of collective unity and orthodoxy. They can even be learned as emotionally dissociated bits of nonsense like the repetitiously mouthed obscenities of a student protest or the rhythmic nonsense of some TV commercials. But in order for change/help/learning to take place they have to be individualized, related in considerable specific detail to the web of uniquely personal events and places. This means a special kind of talk and our plans for this process call for discussion sections in which ideas and words can be related to persons and events.

Finally, we are forced by our theory to be a little specific about *counter-transference*. This is another phrase from the clinical practice of changing; even so, there is something strikingly similar in nontherapeutic situations of teaching and helping. Counter-transference designates the situation in which the troubles of the person to be helped, his ambivalences about learning, his resistances against change, are transferred to the teacher or helper and become operative in him to defeat, delay or inhibit change. The classic illustration of this phenomenon is to be found in the double bind which many workers with adolescents experience: The youngster, ambivalent about the forces which propel him towards maturity and away from the security of childhood, externalizes his angry, frightened confusion as a conflicting set of demands for control and freedom. The worker "falls for" the transference and, projecting his own conflicts about being grown up, angrily and anxiously reacts out of the counter-transference, infantilizing, demanding or, even more confusingly, vacillating between the two. The youngster, resistive against finding the next steps available in his change/growth/learning leaps forward on an impossible tack, eliciting the approval or condemnation of his worker so that when capsizing occurs it can be "blamed" on someone else and the youngster and the worker can both feel justified in their judgments that the task is impossible. It is a tempting aspect of the process. I can testify from so recent a seduction to belief that Christian educators are not too hopeful because they will not follow instructions. Ordinarily, dealing with counter-transference is done with one's peers, supervisors, consultants and the like, not with the persons being helped. But here we are trying to describe a process to fellow workers.

So far, in this analysis of our encounter as an introduction to a theory of change, we have outlined:

1. The initiation as discontent/anxiety in the subject....
2. Responded to by the helper with
    a. emotionally responsive acceptance, and
    b. supportive awareness of achievement, progress to....
3. The beginning phase:
    a. an initial structure for action, time, place, task
    b. an awareness of
        (1) ambivalence

(2) ego autonomy and resistance
(3) individual difference
(4) counter-transference phenomena

We are ready to move on in our outline to the middle or working phase of the helping process. We have come to designate this as the formulation of a working contract within the limits imposed by reality, and with awareness that a teacher/therapist/counselor must be an active creator of a situation in which work can be done. It is as though one was confronted with a three-day pile of dishes, a two-week accumulation of wash and a yard untended for a fortnight. The helping person would first empathically respond and then say, "It's a mess but let's start here and while that's drying get on to that, finishing up over there." There's something quite similar in the more complicated processes of helping/learning/changing: a focusing of discontent on some specific work task seen afresh in the light of some new perspectives which make possible the definition of some new effort. We are convinced by our experiences and our theory that this middle phase is a peculiarly sensitive mutual interaction which compresses into action -- more or less accurately -- the manifold and divergent expectations of the persons involved. We call this the psychological contract and we have been led to believe that the understanding of this concept can place the middle phase of a helping/learning/changing process in a perspective which facilitates the essential work of the process. The meaning of this may be illustrated by a prayer of confession written out of ministry to the young patients in the C. F. Menninger Memorial Hospital and used in the hospital Vespers Service May 5, 1967:

> Almighty and everlasting God, who has ordained order in all things, forgive us for avoiding responsibility. We wish that we could change things by just making up our minds, but we experience our failures like our hands and feet, close and a part of us. Give our better selves the leverage of some useful wisdom, the comfort of someone's responsive interest and some time -- so we can re-shape our lives toward what we can be. In Jesus' name, we pray. Amen.

This evening, Doctor Mitchell will be trying to provide some "useful leverage" through the ideas about the psychological contract and the role of the leader tomorrow. Here, I am only interested in providing an overview of it all.

The mention of "today" and "tomorrow" brings us full circle in this analysis of our encounter -- we meet under the realities and limitations of a time span but we also meet within the adverbial urging of an existential "now." So, at each step of the helping process there is an adverbially limited question, "How can we use this time today to move toward the goals which you have identified as our common purpose and, when we come to the end of our unit of effort, how can we imbed it in the longer, purposeful processes. This conveys a final item from our theory about change/help/learning, namely, that the goal is to relate the experienced past and the anticipated future stresses in such a way that they may be coped with in the present.

Perhaps I can illustrate this whole matter by reading a condensation of a statement by a minister of education to a meeting of laymen and laywomen, who met in response to multiple invitations, appeals, and buttonholings to "consider some more active part in our Christian Education program." He said,

> I'm glad to see you here. We have 90 minutes tonight to consider an important matter. I think I know each of you and I know how much achievement and potential is represented in this room. Frankly, I hope to enlist your talents in the Christian Education program...but I know that I couldn't do that unless, in some way or another, my concern and sense of purpose matched your own. After a while, I'm sure, we'll need to think about your mixed feelings and your sense of unreadiness or resistance but, right now, I'd like to stop talking and ask each of you to say out your explanation of the fact that you answered this invitation, tonight....
>
> The meeting (and meetings) which followed that introduction weren't easy but they initiated a process of helping/teaching/changing which made a big dent on the lethargy of one church.

In these words I have attempted to illustrate one small but critical segment of an educational process. I welcome your efforts to pierce the veil of the particular to the general theories which may be illustrated and, having refined from the concrete some hint of generality, to test your understanding against the uniquely specific.

CURRENT DIRECTIONS IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Jesse H. Ziegler

Members of this adult learning seminar with a special interest in continuing education for the ministry: The occasion of such a seminar with its exploration of the nature of the contemporary world, the ministry to it, the various strategies of the church in society, the relating of objectives to evaluation -- all of these give some indication of how far along we are now in our concern for the continued growth and development of ministry.

I was pleased with the invitation to be present on this occasion and to speak in behalf of the American Association of Theological Schools about things that are happening in theological education on the basis of which your own work will be built. The Association that I represent, composed of 144 member schools, has been related intimately to thought about continuing education through staff or official representatives from very early in the game. We have published one issue of Theological Education dealing with questions of continuing education as they relate to theological seminaries; we have participated in these national gatherings; many of the members of our faculties are active in the teaching that goes on. As theological schools we have certainly made our share of mistakes which need to be remedied in continuing education. It would be a sad underrating, however, to assume that all that we have done is a mistake and if continuing education were to try to do the whole job over, it would doubtless find how much of worth has been put into the basic theological program.

The topic assigned to me for this morning contains within it the possibility of speaking of the ferment that is currently present in theological education, and at the same time permits me to make some forecast of what is likely to happen around the next corner. I will not describe the ferment which is to be seen in theological education, for of that many of you are aware or have read. I shall first of all, however, speak of the causes of that ferment as I see them, because only so can the people in the area represented here understand the dynamism of the present scene. Then, secondly, I will attempt a forecast as to what theological education is likely to be in the next ten to twenty years.

Causes of Ferment in Theological Education

Clearly, at no time in my own experience in theological education and perhaps in a hundred years has there been the stir and the ferment as to purpose, form, process, and locus that is currently to be found.

It is not difficult to find causes that contribute to the rapid changes taking place in theological education. It is more difficult to assess those which contribute most. Some causes have been present for a good while but are developing cumulative effects; others are almost new and the effect is mostly in prospect. Let us look at these causes which seem to contribute most markedly.

There are fundamental changes which have come about in church structures. Although there continue to be resistance movements to church mergers or even to effective cooperation, the overall mood has changed. All of the institutions of the church, all faculty and students in theological seminaries, are influenced by such movements as the Consultation on Church Union. A church such as that in which I hold membership may decide to stay outside but what is going on within that consultation will profoundly change our life. There is serious question as to whether the time of denominational vitality may not be past and conviction that the time for unity in Christ has really arrived calling us to the development of different structures. Not only are denominational structures brought under question but congregational structures also are brought under judgment. Thoughtful people have been unable to shrug aside the significance of the historical circumstances under which congregational life emerged and the necessity for assessing the form of church structures called for in contemporary circumstances. There is a newly favorable perception of the function and mission of bureaucratic structures within the life of the church.

Secondly, the forms and purposes of ministry are undergoing change. The concept of the ministry of the entire church, the laos, the people of God, presses for a rethinking of the purpose and form of the ordained ministry. The opportunity and need for new forms of ministry does not eliminate the need for traditional forms but calls for revision in educational programs. The change in community expectations of the minister suggests the need for change in his education.

Third, there is awareness of experimentation in education for some of the other learned professions. A program of medical education like that set up at Western Reserve University challenges all professions. The refinement of the case study method in the schools of law and business administration at Harvard University leaves none of us untouched. The use of supervision in graduate schools of social work proves instructive and challenging to many of the older professions. Experimentation in these other fields in itself is responsible for some of the ferment in our own field.

Fourth, too many students have found too much of their theological education not relevant to the work they were expected to do immediately on leaving theological school. A few months ago an imaginative minister working with dispossessed young people in an urban setting wrote me, "From 1938 to 1940 I was a Presbyterian student at _____. The training seemed exclusively intellectual.... Most existing seminaries seem quite irrelevant to the pressing needs of society." This product of one of the great seminaries of the country went on to make imaginative suggestions for the improvement of education which he now feels is largely irrelevant. These letters and comments are commonplace and must have in them an element of truth.

Fifth, contemporary student involvement in socio-economic-political affairs across the world has challenged theological students to get out of the stands and onto the field. They want to do their learning while they are practicing the game, not simply from lectures in a locker room. And who is to say that there may not be wisdom in their insistence? The student interracial ministry, the urban training centers, the civil rights protests, the Vietnam concerns, the protests against financial support of apartheid in South Africa, identification with the fruit-pickers in California -- all of these have contributed to the ferment currently to be seen.

Sixth, developments in the teaching of religion at the undergraduate and graduate levels within both private and publicly supported universities of the country have raised a whole series of issues with which theological education must deal. While initially causing consternation and dismay in some quarters, there is a growing conviction that this movement may contribute remarkably to our entire culture and that theological education will take it into full account to the benefit of all concerned.

Seventh, spiralling costs of theological education are forcing administrative officers and governing boards to reassess the delineation of institutional purpose, the possibilities of cooperation, greater specificity of function. To see costs double each decade, and at the same time to be faced with the increasing rate of costs that is likely to be thrust on us by availability of funds in support of those institutions which will compete for books and professors, forces reassessment of the cost picture.

No one of these causes will be sufficient to account for the ferment which is to be seen but working together they provoke major change.

Forecast for Theological Education

Probably no one is adequate to attempt to forecast what the next ten to twenty years may bring and yet all of us who are responsible either must make forecasts or drift on a sea of pious hopes and unpredicted chance. What we will forecast in every case already will have many signs pointing in the direction suggested. If the forecast represents too easy a projection of a curve in which one has insufficient reference points, you will still understand the need for trying your own hand at the process.

First, theological education will increasingly clarify the nature of professional education, as it both shares in the character of and is differentiated from that education which is more research-oriented or in harmony with the graduate style in arts and sciences. There are influential voices within both the Protestant and Roman Catholic communities who say that the two kinds of theological education need to be carried on separately. We have some sympathy with that view but would hope that it may not be necessary and that with clarification of purpose and appropriate assignment of faculty time and resources, professional education of real excellence can be carried on side by side with research-oriented graduate education. It becomes increasingly clear, however, that professional education for ministry can only suffer weakness if a growing portion of the resources of the total enterprise are assigned to the research-oriented graduate aspects of the program and a smaller proportion to the professional part of the program.

Second, new curricular structures will develop that represent radical departures from curriculum built around the classroom lecture, the classical discipline in relative isolation, the location of theological teaching within seminary walls, the relative isolation of teaching in theology from the life of the world or even of the church. Various models will make their appearance commending themselves because they more nearly represent a genuine encounter between theology and the world, between church and society, between ancient and contemporary ways of knowing, between old and new understandings of ministry. Much teaching-learning may go on among teams of students and faculty working and living for parts of the year within the structures of society outside the seminary walls. Major portions of the full period of a man's theological education may be spent in multi-disciplined reflection on situations in the real world where life is being lived, ministries performed, and where God is attempting to accomplish his purposes. It is not that less classical theology will be taught and learned; it is only that theology will be taught and learned in the context in which it arose and where it has relevance.

Third, it seems inevitable that there will be much closer relationships between the college-university situation and the seminary in education for ministry. The very minimum that will happen will be that there will be a much clearer articulation of the functions of the undergraduate college and the seminary as a professional school. The inquiry continues as to how such articulation can best take place and what the form of it should be. The relationships for the future may go much further however. There are those who believe that at the graduate level no small amount of the work could be given and taken in universities supported by public funds. Proponents of this view would say that seminary funds could then be used primarily in education in those areas which are inappropriate for a publicly supported university to carry. There is certainly a viable middle ground which can be achieved in many places long before the one just mentioned. In many places relationships will be developed in which faculty and library resources of universities will provide, even at the graduate level, education in those areas which must be included in contemporary education for ministry and which are the undisputed province of the university, namely, culture and the arts, sociology, psychology, anthropology, etc. Where there are substantial graduate departments of religion there may be opportunity for considerably greater collaboration if the work done by the theological school is of a high caliber and worthy of being carried on in a university community.

Fourth, the major portion of theological education in the years ahead will be ecumenical. It becomes unthinkable that when team ministries present the only viable options in some situations, education for such ministry can be carried on separately. For a time when it was necessary for seminaries to follow a moving frontier with the churches for which they provided clergy, and for a time when every minister stood over against his adversaries from other denominations, the present distribution of seminaries may have been a live option. For a time when the churches are moving toward union or at the very least the most intimate kind of cooperation, only theological education which is truly ecumenical and gives men opportunity to study, worship, and to teach together seems viable. Students and faculty will only be repelled in the years ahead by education that is not truly ecumenical.

Fifth, it now seems quite likely that in the years ahead a substantial portion of theological education will not assume that the students who work with professors are necessarily going into professions, or not even assume that they are necessarily going into the graduate study of theology. Increasingly students are coming to theological school wanting to have a one- or two-year exposure in a thorough-going way to the disciplines of theology in order to be able to think theologically about the various locations into which they go. Such theological thought may not be bookish and cannot be done with any kind of significant separation from the existence of man in his world. It will need to be intimately related to the problems of man's own existence wherever those problems are to be found. It is quite conceivable that for such a period of time men going into secular occupations and men going into the professional ministries of the church will be studying together and interpreting events of a common life from a theological perspective under the guidance of a new breed of faculty who have learned to think theologically, not about creeds and doctrines, but about the events of life around us. This kind of study will be possible only where there are faculty resources of depth and breadth that are flexible in their approach to the life of man.

Sixth, it seems almost trite at this point to say that for the years ahead major parts of theological education will be carried on outside of seminary walls. If we have not already learned from the experience of clinical pastoral education where significant portions of education for ministry have been carried on in health and welfare institutions as well as in penal institutions, we are now learning from the experience of the social ethics people in inner-city life at the Urban Training Center of Chicago, the Detroit Industrial Mission, the Metropolitan Urban Service Training facility in New York and similar educational agencies. There probably are weaknesses in all of these agencies of the past and of the present. We shall need to find new ways of bringing to bear not only the resources of psychology, psychiatry, and sociology on the problems of crisis in personal life, or of crisis in community life, but also how to use the resources of theology, history, Scripture to create teaching-learning teams that will operate outside of seminary walls where the action is. It may well be that the theological professor of the future will need to be much freer to be mobile in his living, working, teaching, worshiping arrangements than in the past. It may be that libraries will need to be decentralized in sections not according to accredited schools but according to places of work, study, and worship outside of seminary walls. The directions pointed to here are only now beginning to be explored but have explosive potential for the future.

Seventh, at this stage it may seem inconceivable but it appears to me quite likely that within the next twenty years the more than two hundred theological seminaries in North America will be reduced to approximately twenty-five centers of theological education. In that time many of the seminaries may retain their own separate identity but in a rather small variety of structures will relate themselves to each other and to a university in order to achieve greater quality, provide ecumenical experience, halt the spiralling costs, and relate effectively to the intellectual thrust of the world of which the university is the most potent symbol. The Executive Committee of the AATS has itself set up a Resources Planning Commission charged with responsibility for the development of a rational plan for the redeployment of resources for theological education. There will be no compulsion to accept or join in such redeployment except the persuasiveness of reason applied to the use of overall resources. What this may mean about the future of a particular school, I cannot at this time predict. My own best judgment would be that any school is well advised for the next twelve months to raise all the money that it can for adding quality to its program, but not to proceed with the erection of any more buildings. We have just announced a substantial foundation grant through the use of which it will be possible to make the kind of careful research studies that need to be made for the development of the required overall planning. We expect to have a report for the 1968 biennial meeting of the Association and believe that at that time directions for development will become much clearer even though much of the work will remain to be done.

Conclusion

To be engaged in the enterprise of educating men and women for Christian ministries is one of the most challenging and exciting occupations for any group of people. This group is in a particular part of that education which is of much interest because it is of great significance and relatively new. There is a certain uneasiness and insecurity that clearly comes with living through the yeasty ferment of this present time. Many of us are convinced that what can come out of this time is a much higher level of quality in theological education, with the chance that for the years ahead men may again find lasting significance in the ministry, and that the ordained ministry as a profession will become the enabling function used by the Lord as his people join in the realization of the city of God. It is to this high calling that men in the craft in which you are engaged are called.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF THE SEMINAR

Henry B. Adams

Hindsight being frequently better than foresight, it is possible to identify, after the seminar ended, certain things which easily eluded attention, or could not have been anticipated in planning for it. Some of these are reflected in an analysis of the evaluation questionnaires filled out by participants. The impressions and interpretations derived from this process are admittedly less than the most rigorous fact-finding, but they are shared for whatever help they may give to the process of future planning, and some record of trends in the evolution of this movement.

Exclusive of speakers who participated only to the extent of making addresses and answering questions, there were 67 registered participants in the 1967 seminar. By contrast, there were 43 registrants at the 1966 seminar held at Michigan State University. Of the 67 participants in the 1967 seminar only 19 were present at the 1966 session. More than two-thirds of the participants at Syracuse University in 1967 were new and did not share the background the rest brought to their participation.

Evaluation questionnaires were filled out by 30 first-year participants, and by 10 of those who had participated the year before. Evaluations were received, therefore, from newcomers and returnees in about the same proportion.

Participants fell into the following categories which may help in understanding their reactions to the experience:

Seminary personnel	24
Denominational persons	17
Church judicatories & pastors	12
People from special agencies	6
Others	8
	67

The preponderance of seminary and denominational representatives is understandable in view of the people who have given leadership to this growing movement nationally through two initial consultations and two Adult Learning Seminars. By the same reasoning, the absence of persons in continuing education for ministers in the colleges and universities is understandable, though regretable. An encouraging feature is the number of pastors and others engaged in continuing education at the lower judicatory levels of the churches, a number large in contrast to their virtual absence in previous years.

The length of time participants have been involved in continuing education and the proportion of their time devoted to it over this period illuminates the character of their involvement:

YEARS OF WORK IN CONTINUING EDUCATION

5 or more years	12 persons
4	5
3	4
2	5
1 or less	10
	40

PROPORTION OF TIME GIVEN TO CONTINUING EDUCATION

Full time	11 persons
Half-time or more	2
Half-time	5
Half-time or less	3
One-quarter time or less	15
None	4
	40

Ten participants were "professional" persons who devote half their time or more to the work and have been at it for four or more years. The other seven who have been working four or more years give only one-quarter of their time to continuing education. Fifteen have worked in the field two years or less. Of these, seven give one-quarter of their time to this work and five of them began their work within the last year. The large majority of participants, therefore, appear to be men and women who give a small part of their time to continuing education and who are new to the work.

The small number of participants present also at the 1966 seminar makes it difficult to make reliable comparisons between the two events. Three reported 1967 was a better seminar, citing a clearer central focus, more general information about continuing education programs, good lectures, absence of T-Groups and greater practicality at their grounds. Two said 1967 was poorer for them, citing the greater importance of T-Group learning experience over lectures, too little time for small group discussion, poorer lectures and unavailability of speakers for conference and small group discussion as their grounds. Five indicated they could not rate one better than the other since each had values which were unique and important for different purposes, and each had weaknesses.

Among those who participated in both seminars, felt needs appear to be quite different, and their difference in reaction may reflect this. In general there seems to have been a consensus that time for association and conversation with other participants is an important aspect of this kind of occasion. Scheduling and facilities in 1967 did not provide adequately for this felt need.

Analysis of how all respondents rated the importance of various elements in the 1967 seminar confirms these impressions and throws some additional light on the usefulness of various aspects:

Most Valuable Element in the Seminar

Association with others	19
Addresses	18
Case studies of others	9
Discussion of addresses	1
Discussion of my own case	0

Least Valuable Element in the Seminar

Discussion of addresses	1
Addresses	11
Discussion of my own case study	4
Case studies of others	2
Association with others	0

The number of times an element is mentioned and identified in the table above does not total forty respondents, since some respondents rated more than one element as of prime importance to him. But the number of mentions does provide some evidence of the importance of opportunity for participants to associate with each other, to share their thinking and discover what others are doing.

Association with others is highest on the "most valuable" list and lowest on the "least valuable". Respondents were clearly divided about the value of addresses, and in general found limited value in the discussion of the addresses as it was carried out. The evaluation of discussion of case studies of their own programs is not very reliable since many indicated that there was no opportunity for this to take place in the groups in which they participated.

Participants were asked to identify the most difficult problems with which they wrestled in their work in continuing education. Not all supplied this information since many were new to the work. And many identified three or four different problems. The following table shows the categories of problem and the number of times they were mentioned by respondents. It is significant that the frequency of mention does not differ materially in rank order between new participants and all participants:

Frequency of Mention -- Most Difficult Problem

	All Men	New Men
Logistics, administration, strategy	14	11
Developing educational design	12	8
Support, backing, money	8	7
Evaluation by students, administration	7	6
Recruiting ministers	7	6
Identifying needs of ministers	6	4
Understanding motivations	6	4
Developing staff personnel	5	4
Philosophy or theory of continuing education	4	3
Getting reliable data	3	1
Defining objectives	3	1
Understanding the changing world	1	1

When these categories are telescoped the results are revealing:

Frequency of Mention -- Most Difficult Problem

	All Men	New Men
Pragmatic aspects (Logistics, Recruitment, Development of staff, Support)	34	24
Theoretical aspects (Philosophy, Evaluation, Objectives, Educational Design)	16	23
Basic Information (Understanding the World, Identifying Needs, Motivation, Getting Data)	16	10

Among all participants the most difficult problems were pragmatic. Theoretical aspects and basic information reflected less than half of the problems mentioned. Comments on the questionnaires indicate that participants frequently came seeking practical help: models of procedure, bibliographic resources, fresh solutions to common problems. The order of mention for problems confirms this. But new participants, who had not shared in the previous seminar, gave almost equal weight to theoretical aspects as the focus of their problems. It may be speculated that participants with previous seminar experience had more opportunity to explore theory and may have felt less troubled at this point.

Practical concern for "how to do it," does not rule out interest in theory and basic information. But it may reflect the instrumentalism of learning which participants value, learning which leads to accomplishment in tangible forms. One may speculate that participants were confirming the conviction reportedly held by large numbers of ministers who seek continuing education, that information and theory are not the end of education but means by which more effectively to carry out their role and mission.

LIST OF REGISTRANTS

ADULT LEARNING SEMINAR

CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTER FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE
Syracuse, New York

ADAMS, George T., Pastor
Groveport Presbyterian Church
275 College Street
Groveport, Ohio

ANDERSON, Lauri J., Pastor
Good Shepherd Lutheran Church
Bellaire 206-14 100th Avenue
Queens, New York

ARTERTON, Frederick H., Warden
College of Preachers
3510 Woodley Road
Washington, D.C. 20016

BACHMANN, E. Theodore, Exec. Sec.
Board of Theological Education
✓B Lutheran Church in America
231 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10010

BERNARDS, Solomon S., Director of Inter-Religious Cooperation Program
Anti-Defamation League
315 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

BONTHIUS, Robert H., Director
Internship for Clergymen in Urban Ministry
Cleveland College
Western Reserve University
1850 Coltman Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44016

BOYCE, Greer, Professor
Emmanuel College
Queen's Park Crescent
Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada

BRADLEY, J. C., Graduate Fellow in Religious Education
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
2825 Lexington Road
Louisville, Kentucky 40206

BROWN, Howard J., Senior Minister
Church of the Saviour
2537 Lee Road
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118

CLARK, J. Albert, Director
Continuing Education
✓B Ohio Council of Churches
141 North Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

CLYDE, J. Douglas, Exec. Sec.
Commission on Continuing Education
✓B United Presbyterian Church in the USA
728 Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pa. 19107

COOPER, Jack, Director
Center of Continuing Education
12 Library Place
Princeton, N.J. 08540

CRAGON, Miller M., Jr., Director
Department of Christian Education
✓B 1047 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10025

CROCKER, Robert B., Chairman
Committee on Continuing Education
First Methodist Church
Fourth and Oak
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

CUNNINGHAM, Raymond, Jr.
Field Executive
Church-World Institute
North Tower Hill Road
RFD Wassaic, New York 12592

EADS, Robert H., Director
Church and Ministry
Colgate Rochester Divinity School
Rochester, New York 14620

EDWARDS, George R., Professor
New Testament
Louisville Presbyterian Seminary
1044 Alta Vista Road
Louisville, Kentucky 40205

EVEREST, Rutherford E., Director of Pastoral Services
Worcester Council of Churches
63 Wachusett Street
Worcester, Mass. 01609

FRERICHS, Robert T., Director
In-Service Training
Urban Church Center
American Baptist Convention
Green Lake, Wisconsin 54941

GAMBLE, Connolly C., Jr., Director
Continuing Education
Union Theological Seminary
3401 Brook Road
Richmond, Virginia 23227

GREEN, Thomas, Professor of Cultural Foundation of Education
Syracuse University
610 E. Fayette Street
Syracuse, New York 13202

HARPER, F. Nile, Associate Professor of Church and Community and Director of Field Education
New York Theological Seminary
235 East 49th Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

HENDRICKSON, John H., Director
Continuing Education
Union Theological Seminary
3401 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10027

HENRY, Stuart C., Professor
Duke University Divinity School
Durham, North Carolina 27706

HOWE, Reuel L., Director
Institute for Advanced Pastoral Studies
380 Lone Pine Road
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48013

HULAC, George E., Associate Secretary
Division of Continuing Education
✓ B
United Presbyterian Church in the USA
425 Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pa. 19107

IRELAND, Michael G., Pastor
Continuing Education Committee
Old Manor Baptist Church
5251 East Elm
Wichita, Kansas 67208

JOHNSON, Gerald
Assistant to the President
Illinois Synod
327 South La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

KELLY, John R., Interim Coordinator
Pacific Northwest Council on Theological Education
1134 S.W. Market Street
Portland, Oregon 97201

KEMPSON, Obert, Jr., Consultant
Pastoral Services
South Carolina Department of Mental Health
Drawer 119
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

KLINK, Thomas W.
Division of Religion and Psychiatry
The Menninger Foundation
Topeka, Kansas

MARSHALL, Robert J., President
Illinois Synod
Lutheran Church in America
327 South La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

MARTIN, George W., Pastor
Chairman, Board of Ministerial Training
Trinity Methodist Church
P.O. Box 3241
Little Rock, Arkansas 72207

McIVER, Malcolm C.
Dean of the Faculty
Presbyterian School of Christian Education
1205 Palmyra Avenue
Richmond, Virginia 23227

McNEUR, Ronald, Studies Secretary
Division of Higher Education
United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pa. 19107

MILLER, James B., Professor of Christian Education
Christian Theological Seminary
1000 West 42nd Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46208

MILLS, Edgar W., Director
Ministry Studies Board
601 Dupont Building
Washington, D.C.

MURRAY, Richard, Director
Continuing Education
Perkins School of Theology
Dallas, Texas 75222

NESMITH, Richard, Exec. Sec.
National Division of the Board of Missions
The Methodist Church
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

NEUGARTEN, Bernice, Professor
Human Development
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637

NICELY, Paul, Associate Professor
Pastoral Care
Methodist Theological School in Ohio
Delaware, Ohio 43015

NICHOLS, J. B., Coordinator of Student Affairs
Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary
Strawberry Point
Hill Valley, California 94942

O'DONNELL, Joseph E., Jr.
Director of Church and College Relations
Andover Newton Theological Seminary
210 Herrick Road
Newton Centre, Mass. 02159

PETERSON, Ralph E., Parish Pastor
St. Peter's Lutheran Church
130 East 54th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022

PFLEGER, Allan, Dean
Cleveland College
Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

POWELL, Robert R., Professor
Christian Education
Wesley Theological Seminary
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

PROCTOR, Robert A.
Professor of Learning
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Louisville, Kentucky 44106

REID, Clyde H., Secretary
United Church Board for Homeland Ministries
United Church of Christ
287 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10010

ROSSMAN, Parker, Director
Ecumenical Continuing Education Center
Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ)
363 St. Ronan Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

ROUCH, Mark A., Associate Director
Department of Ministerial Education
The Methodist Church
P.O. Box 871
Nashville, Tennessee 37202

SALMON, John M., Director
Continuing Education
Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
1044 Alta Vista Road
Louisville, Kentucky 40205

SHENEMAN, Lloyd, Associate Professor
Christian Education
Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325

SHOPE, John H. Professor of Continuing Education
/B Conwell School of Theology
1938 Park Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

SIMMONS, James P., Associate Director
Institute for Advanced Pastoral Studies
380 Lone Pine Road
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48013

STUMP, John P., Associate Secretary
Continuing Education
B Lutheran Church in America
2900 Queen Lane
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19129

STOKES, Mack B., Associate Dean
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

SUTHERLAND, R., Jr.
Meadville Theological School of Lombard College
5701 Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

THOMPSON, Elmer A., Associate Director
Office and Field Services
Methodist Board of Education
P.O. Box 871
Nashville, Tennessee 37202

TOUHSAENT, Wilson W.
Atone Lutheran Church
Wyomissing, Pennsylvania

THULIN, Richard L., Pastor
Bethesda Lutheran Church
305 St. Ronan Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

TROTTER, Frank E., Chairman
Christian Education Department
P.O. Box 1024
Pulaski, Virginia 23401

URICH, Bruce W. H.
Synod of Ohio's Committee on Continuing Education
6501 Woodville Drive
Dayton, Ohio 45414

VAN ZANTEN, John W., Secretary
Division of Continuing Education
United Presbyterian Church in the
/B U.S.A.
425 Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pa. 19107

VICKERY, T. H., Chairman
Commission on Continuing Ministerial Education
✓B The Methodist Church
120 E. Buford Street
Gaffney, South Carolina 29340

WELSH, Clement W., Director of Studies
College of Preachers
3510 Woodley Road
Washington, D.C. 20016

WESTBERG, Granger E., Dean
Institute of Religion
Texas Medical Center
Houston, Texas 77025

WHITE, C. Dale, Associate General Secretary
General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church
100 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20002

WINDHAM, Lillian A., Program Associate
Continuing Education
Institute of Strategic Studies
/B United Presbyterian Church in the USA
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

WOLF, C. Umhau, Director
Continuing Education
Southern District
American Lutheran Church
4211 Venado
Austin, Texas 78731

ZAHN, Willard, Member
Board of Theological Education
Lutheran Church in America
7118 McCallum Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19119

ZEIGLER, Leslie, Associate Professor
Philosophy of Religion and Christian Ethics
Bangor Theological Seminary
Bangor, Maine 04401

ZIEGLER, Jesee, Executive Secretary
American Association of Theological Schools
534 Third National Building
Dayton, Ohio 45402

STAFF

ADAMS, Henry B., Director
Church Ministry Studies
Department of Ministry
✓ R National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

ALLEN, Linda L., Secretary to Director of Church Ministry Studies
Department of Ministry
National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

BIERSDORF, John E., Executive Director
Department of Ministry
National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

June 14, 1967

The meeting was called to order at the Continuing Education Center for the Public Service, Syracuse University, at 7:30 p.m. Mark Rouch presided until a president was elected. Henry Adams was named as Secretary pro tempore. Interested participants in the Adult Learning Seminar assembled for the week were present.

A review of the history of the movement to organize a society was made by Henry Adams. At the Adult Learning Seminar, Michigan State University, which followed two annual Consultations on Continuing Education for Ministers (Andover-Newton Seminary and the University of Chicago), a meeting of interested persons was called. Those present constituted themselves a society and named a committee composed of Mark Rouch, Mark Rich, Ralph Peterson, Connelly C. Gamble, and Henry B. Adams to propose by-laws for the organization. This committee drafted a preliminary proposal of a structure and set of purposes which were reviewed and endorsed by the National Continuing Education Committee of the National Council of Churches' Department of Ministry. Copies of the revised proposed by-laws were circulated with the invitation to the Adult Learning Seminar at Syracuse and have been available to all present for study. HISTORY

After preliminary discussion, it was moved and

VOTED: To proceed to the organization of a Society and to approve the By-Laws. MOB-1-67 AMENDMENT OF PROPOSED BY-LAWS

VOTED: That the proposed By-Laws be reviewed section by section, and that the necessary amendments be made. MOB-2-67

By common consent, it was agreed that editorial changes in the By-Laws should be entered informally on the proposed form, but that substantive changes should be incorporated in the minutes.

It was also moved and

VOTED: To change the name to the "SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY" (rather than "MINISTERS"). MOB-3-67

The following motions failed to carry: That Section 2, Article II be referred to the new Executive Board for study and preparation of possible amendment (to define whether the same person may vote as both institutional representative and as individual member; that the same section be amended by addition of the sentence, "No individual may cast more than one vote."

No further motions on this point were recognized, and the matter was left open for future experience to dictate.

The matter of nominations was discussed and it was moved and

VOTED: That the procedure for nominations and the possibility of re-election to office be referred to the new Executive Board. MOB-4-67

After reviewing all sections and making editorial revisions, it was moved and

VOTED: That the Charter and By-Laws be approved as amended and revised. MOB-5-67

The adopted Charter and By-Laws were made a part of these minutes and are appended hereto.

The Committee on Organization and By-Laws was dismissed with thanks.

Those present then proceeded to organize themselves by appending their names to the charter and submitting their dues. By common consent, it was agreed that charter members shall include those subscribing to the charter at this occasion as well as those who enroll under the By-Laws adopted, and that they pay their dues before the next annual meeting.

A slate of nominations prepared by the Committee on Organization and By-Laws was read. Connolly Gamble was unanimously elected president and took the chair.

It was, however, moved and

VOTED: That the By-Laws be reconsidered and that Section 1, Article IV be amended to provide nine members of the Executive Board (instead of six) in rotating classes of three each. MOB-6-67

That Section 3 of the above article be amended to make six members of the Executive Board a quorum. MOB-7-67

The By-Laws thus amended were unanimously adopted.

The following nominees to office were elected by unanimous ballot:

Secretary-Treasurer	R. Lewis Johnson
Executive Secretary	Henry B. Adams

Executive Board	J. Douglas Clyde	(3 years)
	Reuel Howe	(3 years)
	Richard Murray	(3 years)
	John Stump	(2 years)
	John Salmon	(2 years)
	Parker Rossman	(2 years)
	Clement Welsh	(1 year)
	Michael Ireland	(1 year)
	Obert Kempson	(1 year)

NEW BUSINESS

The Secretary-Treasurer was instructed to write the Executive Board of the National Council of Churches' Department of Ministry requesting the services of Henry Adams (of the Department staff) as Executive Secretary of the Society for the 1967-68 year.

Members present suggest for the next annual meeting the second week in June, 1968, subject to clearance of dates with the National Council of Churches Centralized Calendar.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY

CHARTER

WHEREAS the need for continuing education for ministry is growing at an accelerating rate.

AND WHEREAS growing numbers of persons are giving direction to the work of continuing education for ministry or are actively concerned for the enhancement of ministry through education.

AND WHEREAS mutual effort is vital to effectiveness in continuing education for ministry.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we, the undersigned, do constitute ourselves a voluntary association to be known as the SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY (SACEM) and do adopt the attached by-laws by which to govern ourselves and our activities.

CHARTER MEMBERS

Name	Address

BY-LAWS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY

Article I. - PURPOSES

The purposes of the Society shall be:

1. To bring together persons concerned for continuing education for ministry for mutual stimulation, information and effort.
2. To identify issues which affect the advancement of continuing education for ministry and to evolve strategies, programs, and methods for its advancement through the work of the Society.
3. To disseminate information, publish literature, and make available resources important to the work of the Society and its members.
4. To express common judgments on matters affecting continuing education for ministry and cooperate with other agencies sharing the same concerns.

Article II. - MEMBERS

Section 1. Any persons who are engaged in the work of continuing education for ministry and any others actively concerned for the enhancement of ministry through education shall be eligible for membership in the Society upon payment of the required dues annually.

Section 2. Memberships shall be of two kinds: Individual and Institutional members, each entitled to one vote. Individual members shall pay dues of ten dollars each per year. A member institution shall pay dues of twenty-five dollars per year and designate one of its employees as its voting representative.

Article III. - OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Secretary-Treasurer and an Executive Secretary. Officers shall be members of the Society, elected for a term of one year.

Section 2. The President shall preside at business meetings of the Society and at meetings of the Executive Board.

Section 3. The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep the records of the Society, shall receive and disburse funds, and shall preside over business meetings of the Society or the Executive Board in the absence of the President, or at his request.

Section 4. The Executive Secretary shall be the administrative officer of the Society. He shall maintain communications with members, arrange conferences and other meetings held by the Society, as directed by the Executive Board, and shall represent the Society in communications and in relationships with other organizations and agencies.

Section 5. The same person may fill the offices of both Secretary-Treasurer and Executive Secretary.

Article IV. - THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Section 1. The Executive Board of the Society shall be composed of the President (with vote), the Executive Secretary (without vote), the Secretary-Treasurer (without vote), and nine members of the Society elected to serve in rotation for three year terms. At the first election, three members of the Executive Board shall be elected to serve for one year, three for two years, and three for three years. When a member of the Executive Board is no longer able to serve, the Executive Board may appoint a member of the Society to fill the unexpired term of office.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of the Executive Board to review the records of the Society, to authorize disbursement of funds, to approve plans for conferences and other meetings, to oversee publication of literature and dissemination of information and to develop plans for the activities of the Society. The Executive Board shall report to the members annually, and its actions shall be subject to review at the annual meeting of members.

Section 3. The Executive Board shall meet at least once a year at a time and place designated by the President and the Executive Secretary. Six voting members of the Executive Board shall constitute a quorum to do business.

Article V. - COMMITTEES

Section 1. Committees of the Society shall be authorized by action of the Society or the Executive Board, except as otherwise provided in the By-Laws.

Section 2. Committee members shall be appointed by the President unless otherwise provided in the action authorizing the Committee or in the By-Laws.

Article VI. - MEETINGS

Section 1. An annual meeting of the Society shall be held at the time and place set by the Executive Board.

Section 2. Other meetings of the Society may be called by the Executive Board.

Section 3. For any meeting of the Society, sixty days notice in writing shall be given to members.

Section 4. The members present at any meeting of the Society shall constitute a quorum.

Article VII. - ELECTIONS

The officers of the Society and the members of the Executive Board shall be elected by a simple majority vote at the annual meeting.

Article VIII. - AMENDMENTS

The By-Laws of the Society may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Society present at the annual meeting, provided that the proposed amendment has been submitted in writing to the members not less than sixty days before action on the proposal takes place.

Information About The

SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY

PURPOSE:

1. To bring together persons concerned for continuing education for ministry for mutual stimulation, information and effort.
2. To identify issues which affect the advancement of continuing education for ministry and to evolve strategies, programs, and methods of advancement through the work of the Society.
3. To disseminate information, publish literature and make available resources important to the work of the Society and its members.
4. To express common judgments on matters affecting continuing education for ministry and cooperate with other agencies sharing the same concerns.

MEMBERS:

Persons who are engaged in the work of continuing education for ministry and any others actively concerned for the enhancement of ministry through education are eligible for membership upon payment of annual dues.

DUES:

Individual membership dues ... $10.00 per year
Institutional membership ..... 25.00 per year

STRUCTURE:

The Society is led by an Executive Board elected by members at the Annual Meeting now scheduled for the second week in June, 1968.

OFFICERS:

President .... Connolly C. Gamble, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer ... R. Lewis Johnson
Executive Secretary ... Henry B. Adams

Executive Board	Term Expires
J. Douglas Clyde	1970
Reuel Howe	1970
Richard Murray	1970

Executive Board	Term Expires
John Stump	1969
John Salmon	1969
Parker Rossman	1969
Michael Ireland	1968
Obert Kempson	1968
Clement Welsh	1968

NEW MEMBERSHIPS:

Requests for copies of the by-laws of the Society and applications for membership may be sent to the office of SACEM,

Suite 760
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

(Phone: (212) 870-2458)

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 18 1968
on Adult Education

Published by
Council Press
for
The Department of Ministry
National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

BC03-74 price $4.00 printed in U.S.A.